DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 161 406 IR 006 119

AUTHOR	Casey, Joseph; And Others
TITLE	A Study of Library Cooperatives, Networks and Demonstration Projects. Final Report. Volume II: Case Study Reports: Twelve Projects Supported by the HEA II-B Library Research and Demonstration Program and LSCA III Multitype Library Cooperation and Networking in Ten States.
INSTITUTION	Applied Management Sciences, Inc., Silver Spring, Md.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Office of Planning, Budgeting, and Evaluation.
PUB DATE	31 Mar 78
CONTRACT	300-76-0464
NOTE	441p.; For related document, see IR 006 118
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$23.43 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Case Studies; *Demonstration Projects; *Interagency Cooperation; *Libraries; Library Education; *Library Networks; Library Programs; Library Services; Needs Assessment; On Line Systems; Professional Continuing Education; Referral; Reports; Shared Services
IDENTIFIERS	*Higher Education Act; *Library Services and Construction Act

ABSTRACT

Case studies describing programs funded under the Library Research and Demonstration Component (II-B) of the Higher Education Act (HEA), and Title III of the Library Services and Construction Act (LSCA) are included. The awarding of grants, and contracts to support research and demonstrations for improving library and information sciences, education in information science and librarianship, and disseminating information derived from the program is authorized under the HEA II-B. Twelve projects responding to this program's emphases are described, including these four case studies: (1) a demonstration of how schools and public libraries reverse illiteracy; (2) interrelated library and basic education programs for disadvantaged adults; (3) the development of a computerized regional library system (OCLC); and (4) the development of strategies for dealing with information needs of urban residents. Title III of LSCA provides funds for support and expansion of statewide networks, local library cooperatives, and participation in multistate networks. Programs in Alaska, California, Minnesota, Mississippi, New Hampshire, New York, Rhode Island, Texas, and Virginia are included. Each describes state library development; management at the state level; impact of federal and state requirements and controls; use of funds; state membership in interstate and multistate networks; program strengths and weaknesses; future directions; and detailed descriptions of the projects. (Author/MBR)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

G-100

A STUDY OF LIBRARY COOPERATIVES, NETWORKS AND DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

FINAL REPORT

VOLUME II

Case Study Reports:

Twelve Projects Supported by the HEA II-B
Library Research and Demonstration Program

and

LSCA III Multitype Library Cooperation and Networking
in Ten States

by:

Joseph Casey, Carol Novalis, Dr. Ruth Patrick

March 31, 1978

Prepared for:

Office of Planning, Budgeting, and Evaluation
U.S. Office of Education
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

Contract No.: 300-76-0464

ED161406

IR006119

962 Wayne Avenue • Suite 701 • Silver Spring, Maryland 20910
Telephone 301 585-8181
APPLIED MANAGEMENT SCIENCES

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

PREFACE iii

PART I: CASE STUDIES OF 12 PROJECTS SPONSORED BY THE HEA II-B LIBRARY RESEARCH AND DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM 1.1

Overview 1.2

Case Study Methodology 1.3

Structure of the Case Studies 1.6

Interagency Planning for Student Learning Resources in Philadelphia and Collaboration with an Innercity Community in Conducting and Evaluating a Student Library and Learning Center Demonstration (also known as the Philadelphia Student Library Resources Project, or the Action Library). 1.8

Interrelating Library and Basic Education Services for Disadvantaged Adults: A Demonstration of Four Alternative Working Models. . 1.25

Development of Criteria for the Implementation and Establishment of a Neighborhood Information Center in Five Public Libraries in Five Cities: Atlanta, Cleveland, Detroit, Houston, and Queensborough (New York City). 1.35

Development of a Computerized Regional Library System 1.50

Demonstration and Evaluation of the Effects of Incentives on Resource Sharing Using a Computerized Interlibrary Communications System 1.69

Relationship of Social Participation to Use of Media Among Mexican-American Urban Poor (Latino Communications Project). 1.83

Minority Program Development for Libraries and Learning Resources 1.92

The Development of Strategies for Dealing With the Information Needs of Urban Residents. 1.101

Library School Education Program Without Walls. 1.112

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Contd.)

PAGE

The Development of a Model Interdisciplinary Continuing Education Program for Librarians. . 1.125

Study for the Design of an Optimum System for a Mail Order Book Delivery System in the State of Washington. 1.140

Study and Development of an Automated Instructional Materials Handling Program . . . 1.153

PART II: LIBRARY SERVICES AND CONSTRUCTION ACT: TITLE III--INTERLIBRARY COOPERATION-CASE STUDIES OF LSCA III IN TEN STATES 2.1

Overview. 2.2

Case Study Methodology. 2.3

Structure of the Case Studies 2.5

- Alaska 2.8
- California 2.37
- Minnesota 2.69
- Mississippi. 2.108
- New Hampshire. 2.131
- New York 2.155
- North Dakota 2.177
- Rhode Island 2.209
- Texas. 2.226
- Virginia 2.254

PREFACE

This volume of the Final Report presenting the results of Applied Management Sciences' "Study of Library Cooperatives, Networks, and Demonstration Projects," contains case studies appropriate to the two Federal programs falling within the scope of the study: the Library Research and Demonstration Component of Title II-B of the Higher Education Act, and Title III of the Library Services and Construction Act--interlibrary cooperation and networking. Part one presents 12 case studies of HEA II-B Library Research and Demonstration projects, and Part Two presents case studies of the operation and impact of LSCA III in 10 States. These case studies are the product of extensive interviews with key personnel ranging from State Librarians to respected researchers and librarians throughout the country. The case studies provide important insights into operations of the two Programs and have implications for future directions in networking and library research and demonstration at all levels.

The case studies were conducted by a number of persons. We are particularly indebted to: Dr. Jerome Wright, Paula Spear, Carrie Pachon, Janis Jordan, and Louise Gray.

PART I

CASE STUDIES OF 12 PROJECTS SPONSORED BY THE HEA II-B LIBRARY RESEARCH AND DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM

Overview

The awarding of grants and contracts to support research and demonstrations for improving library and information sciences, improving education in information science and librarianship, and disseminating information derived from the Program, is authorized under the Library Research and Demonstration Component of the Higher Education Act, Title II-B. This is USOE's only Program of sponsored research in this area. Each Fiscal Year the Program awards an average of 20 grants worth a total of $1 million. As a rule these grants are awarded to respond to a variety of areas or subject emphases defined by the Program.[1] Since Fiscal Year 1967 the Program has awarded a total of 277 grants. During the period being studied, Fiscal Years 1971 through 1976, a total of 131 grants were awarded to conduct 77 separate research and demonstration projects. These projects were surveyed and the results of this survey are presented in Volume I.

As an integral part of its study of the impact of the HEA II-B Library Research and Demonstration Program, Applied Management Sciences conducted a series of intensive case studies of 12 projects responding to the full range of the Program's emphases. The purposes of these case studies were to 1) investigate a subset of projects in a comprehensive manner, in order to develop a greater understanding of the intricacies and nuances which characterize the Program, and 2) provide corroborating or validating data for the telephone survey of all grantees. In order to place the case studies in the proper perspective, and to clearly understand the structure of each report, the following sections provide a more detailed discussion of the method used to conduct the case studies and the format of these case studies.

---

[1] For Fiscal Year 1977 these subject emphases or categories were: institutional cooperation to serve special target groups; technology; functional development; planning and development; and education and training.

Case Study Methodology

The present study is designed to measure the extent to which the HEA II-B Library Research and Demonstration Program has succeeded in sponsoring projects corresponding to its various subject categories, identifying factors associated with the Program's success or failure, and presenting alternatives to present Federal (USOE) policy.[1] And, although a survey of all Project Directors receiving grants since 1971 was conducted, it was also recognized in the initial design that, by definition, survey data would be limited in terms of its ability to provide the desired level of sensitivity. Because of this, it was determined that intensive, onsite case studies would be conducted using trained interviewers having a background in the library and information sciences. The results of the case studies would then be prepared in report form to be used by the evaluators in analyzing the results of the various surveys. Also, these reports would be presented as part of the final report.

Selection of the case study projects was expected to follow a simple procedure whereby two projects corresponding to each of the six subject categories would be selected.[2] Following an intensive analysis of the pattern of grants and associated factors including level of funding, duration of project, and comparative emphasis given the various subject categories, it was determined that a more rigorous selection strategy would yield more appropriate information. Using a judgmental or purposive approach, 12 projects were selected. The approach used was to first categorize all projects in terms of the following variables:

- Funding level. High level--greater than $100,000; or Low level--less than $100,000.

---

[1] If the reader is interested in a more detailed discussion of the study evaluation objectives, refer to Chapters 1 and 3 of Volume I.

[2] For purposes of this study, only six program areas or subject categories were defined by USOE. Consideration was given to using a random selection design which would equal the probability of each project being selected. This approach was rejected because of the extensive variability which characterizes the population of projects.

- Length of project. More than one year or less than one year.
- Subject area of project. One of the five subject categories defined for the study.[1]

This categorization schema represented by a 24 cell matrix was analyzed. As a result, it was determined that projects would be selected from "cells" so as to best approximate the actual patterns of funding. Two immediate outcomes are evident. First, demonstration projects were selected overwhelmingly. Second, more long term projects directed toward the development of alternative library programs through the use of existing resources were selected than would have been expected. However, no subject category was deleted from the schema. The projects selected for case study are listed in Exhibit 1. One project receiving sizable funds over an extended period of time refused to participate in this part of the study and it was necessary to select another project to replace it.[2]

The case studies are based upon findings obtained onsite through: 1) interviews with key project staff, representatives of sponsoring organizations, and participants in the project; 2) observation of project operations including visits to additional demonstration sites; and 3) review of reports and records generated by the project. Some projects presented interesting data collection situations. For example, over half of the projects had ceased operations and it was necessary to visit the former Project Director in one location, and the now terminated project at its former site. Also, some of the projects used demonstration sites in more than one State, requiring the researcher to travel to sites in different States. Finally, some of the projects had been completed over four years.

---

[1] These categories were: use of community resources in new ways; development of service patterns relevant to target populations; development of more efficient use of information resources (networking); design of training programs; and an other category for the most part containing projects to develop new technologies. The categories cross cut the areas emphasized by USOE each Fiscal Year.

[2] This project had a number of internal problems particularly its relation with the sponsoring association. Also, tangible products were difficult to identify. A case study of this project would have yielded valuable insights, but the overall impact of it not being studied was slight.

EXHIBIT 1: SUMMARY OF HEA II-B LIBRARY RESEARCH AND DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS SELECTED FOR CASE STUDY BY SELECTION VARIABLES

	Project Name	Subject Category	Funding Level[1]	Number of Years Funded Since 1971
1.	Philadelphia Student Library Resources Project (Philadelphia School District)	Community Resources	High ($1,200,000)	4 years
2.	Interrelating of Library and Basic Education Services for Disadvantaged Adults (Morehead State University)	Community Resources	High ($625,000)	3 years
3.	Neighborhood Information Center Project (Cleveland Public Library)	Community Resources	High ($875,000)	3 years
4.	Development of a Computerized Regional Shared Cataloging System (Ohio College Library Center)	Networking	High ($125,000)	1 year
5.	Demonstration and Evaluation of Effects of Incentives on Resource Sharing Using NELINET (New England Library Board)	Networking	Low ($76,000)	1 year
6.	Relationship of Social Participation to Use of Media Among Mexican-American Urban Poor (University of Wisconsin)	Special Target Populations	Low ($18,000)	1 year
7.	Minority Program Development for Libraries and Learning Resources (Florida State University)	Special Target Populations	High ($116,000)	1 year
8.	Development of Strategies to Deal with the Information Needs of Urban Residents (University of Washington)	Special Target Populations	High ($206,000)	3 years
9.	Library School Education Program Without Walls (University of Southern California)	Training and Education	High ($155,000)	3 years
10.	Development of a Model Interdisciplinary Education Curriculum for Librarians (Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments)	Training and Education	Low ($34,000)	3 years
11.	Study for Design of an Optimal System for[2] Mail Order Book Delivery (Washington State Library Agency)	Mail Order Delivery	Low ($7,500)	1 year
12.	Study and Development of Automated[2] Instructional Materials Handling Program (Los Angeles United School District)	School Media Center	High ($280,000)	3 years

---

[1] Funding figures are approximate, due to rounding.

[2] These projects represent 10 such projects that do not logically fit into the more general program categories.

ago, and it was necessary to carefully reconstruct the project's history and identify key persons. Project Directors were particularly helpful in this regard.

Collection of data for the case studies was structured around the use of key items (questions) in the instrument used to interview Project Directors in the full-scale survey. In addition each researcher developed a historical profile of the project. The results of each site visit were carefully reviewed and written up in the form of a report. These reports are presented in this part of Volume II.

Structure of the Case Studies

The case studies presented here have three main sections. The first and second sections examine 1) the project, and 2) its relationship to the HEA II-B Library Research and Demonstration Program's objectives and policies. The third section examines the viewpoints of project staff about the grant program and its impact on the state-of-the-art, and recommended changes to the Program. Each case study concludes with an assessment of the project by the researcher who visited the site.

The major subsections of each case study, with the exception of the project descriptions, correspond to portions of the questionnaires utilized in both telephone and onsite interviews. An analysis of responses from all HEA II-B Library Research and Demonstration projects has been presented in Volume I of this report. Because the HEA II-B Library Research and Demonstration Program addressed several program areas, and because projects can be quite diverse in terms of their size, approach, orientation toward research or demonstration, and method, the case studies vary slightly in format and detail of discussion. In general, each case study addresses each of the following topics:

1. INTRODUCTION: This section presents a brief overview of the project's purpose and overall approach. It includes an assessment of the progress of the project at the time of the site visit, and an overview of the contents of the case study report.

2. HISTORY OF THE PROJECT: This section provides an indepth discussion of the project's characteristics, including its purposes, objectives and methodology. It also presents respondents' reports of problems, successes and failures. Project activities in the areas of dissemination, evaluation and establishment of relationships with other projects are described. The section concludes with presentations of the findings and results of project's tasks, and a discussion of impact including the potential for or experiences in replicating the project.

3. IMPACT OF HEA II-B LIBRARY RESEARCH AND DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM ON THIS PROJECT. This section is concerned with the effect of HEA II-B administrative practices on the project, especially the grant solicitation-award process, the role that an HEA II-B Advisory Panel might play in this process, the project staff recommendations for future changes to the HEA II-B Library Research and Demonstration Program in the areas of grant size, preference for research or demonstration, and the Program size. This section concludes with a discussion of future directions for the Federal Government's role in funding library research and demonstration projects, and with a summary/assessment of the project being studied.

HEA II-B

LIBRARY RESEARCH AND DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM CASE STUDY

Project Title:	Interagency Planning for Student Learning Resources in Philadelphia and Collaboration with an Innercity Community in Conducting and Evaluating a Student Library and Learning Center Demonstration (also known as the Philadelphia Student Library Resources Project, or the Action Library)	
Project Director:	John Q. Benford Government Systems and Studies, Inc.	
Sponsoring Agency:	School District of Philadelphia	
Period of Performance:	July, 1968 - June, 1975	
Amount of Funding:	HEA II-B	$1,850,000
	ESEA Title III	$ 600,000
	LSCA I	$ 150,000 (estimated)
	Local Funds	$ 75,000 (estimated)
Location:	Philadelphia, Pennsylvania	

I: INTRODUCTION

The purpose of the Philadelphia Student Library Resources Project was to demonstrate and evaluate how school and public libraries can help reverse the trend of illiteracy and declining use of libraries in inner city communities. The project was undertaken in response to the need to demonstrate that local agencies, through a cooperative effort, can provide alternative library settings for inner-city youth who have tended to escape the impact of more traditional learning and library environments. For a number of reasons discussed later, HEA II-B Library Research and Demonstration funds were sought to support such an effort.

The project falls within the Office of Library and Learning Resource's emphasis on exploring the use of community resources to support non-traditional library programs and services. It was first funded in 1968 and continued to receive HEA II-B Library Research and Demonstration grants as well as other grants for a period of seven years ending in 1975. The grantee for the project was the School District of Philadelphia but it had other sponsors including the Free Library of Philadelphia and the Philadelphia Archdiocese Schools. The project was conducted under the overall direction of John Q. Benford of Government Studies and Systems, Inc., (a private consulting firm based in Philadelphia). Over the seven-year period, over $2.7 million was spent to support the project. Approximately 70 percent of this amount was made up of HEA II-B Library Research and Demonstration funds.

It is difficult to assess the impact of this project. Following withdrawal of support by USOE, the Philadelphia School District funded the demonstration component of the project--the Action Library--for one year. The Action Library is now closed and the Philadelphia School District expects to distribute the library's materials and equipment to public schools in the surrounding neighborhoods. There is no evidence that the project has been replicated in other school districts or jurisdictions despite the project's high visibility and the extensive interest shown in the project by other school districts.

The report presented here provides a history of the Philadelphia Student Library Resources Project, its relationship with the HEA II-B Library Research and Demonstration Program, and an examination of respondents' views on the direction the Library Research and Demonstration Program should take in the future. Finally this report provides an assessment of the project based on interviews with key actors in the project and review of the project's many reports and related documents.

2: HISTORY OF THE PROJECT[1]

2.1: Project Objectives

The purpose of the Philadelphia Student Library Resources Project was to develop a comprehensive approach to the design and implementation of an alternative library program appropriate to inner-city neighborhoods. This was to be based on sound research, community support, involvement by representatives of major educational and library agencies, and an ongoing evaluation of impact.

To meet this objective, the project first conducted a comprehensive study of the use of learning media in school and public libraries, as well as an analysis of the availability of such materials. The essential goal was to identify feasible ways of providing the context which would, in turn, provide the means for bridging the gap between the student and learning materials most appropriate to the inner-city youth. This led to the establishment of what became known as the Action Library, a learning resource center located in a non-traditional setting--a portion of a community hall in a church located in a low income, primarily black area in central Philadelphia. The Action Library was designed to provide the desired bridging affect through:

---

[1] This section of the report is based on interviews with the project's staff and review of key documents, including these major reports:

Martin, Lowell A., "The Philadelphia Library Project, The Action Library: It's Purpose and Program," June, 1972.

Government Studies and Systems, *Philadelphia Student Library Resources Project: Final Report*, (submitted to the Office of Libraries and Learning Resources, USOE), July 1976.

Benford, John Q., *Student Library Resource Requirements in Philadelphia: An Annual Report Covering Phase IV, July 1, 1972 - June 30, 1973* (submitted to the Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education, USOE), December, 1973.

- A community-based project, free of the traditional restrictions of established schools and libraries
- A community-oriented program involving students and other persons from the neighborhood in most aspects of its operation, including staffing
- Provision of multi-media resources selected to interest children and young people
- A multi-disciplinary staff mix, including service teams of librarians, teachers, and other specialists
- Involvement of parents in the learning process, as well as children and young people
- Activities designed to attract and stimulate young people and to develop their interests (rather than simply being available for those with the initiative to seek out the center)
- Inter-agency sponsorship by the school systems and the public library, with the overall goal of fostering change in these systems.

The project also sought to provide an ongoing evaluation and dissemination component capable of generating and documenting impact data which could then be used as the basis of providing definitive indicators of the approach's feasibility.

The project's various objectives were realized to varying degrees. However, USOE support terminated in 1975 and the demonstration component of the project was unable to continue testing all aspects of the project's operations during its last year.

2.2: Methodology and Chronology

The idea for the project first surfaced in the Philadelphia School District's evaluation research office in 1968. The intent then was to study student library needs, resources, use patterns, and attitudes. This led to the writing of the initial proposal. A Study Planning Committee consisting of representatives of the School District of Philadelphia, Philadelphia Archdiocese Schools, the Free Library of Philadelphia, and a number of private schools was formed. This Committee was to serve as one of the key elements of the project over its seven-year existence. Lowell Martin and representatives of the Government Studies Center (now known as Government Studies and Systems, but at the time affiliated with the University of Pennsylvania) were involved because of their past work for the Philadelphia Free Library. Although a small grant was obtained from a private institute, it was necessary to seek additional funds. The HEA II-B Library Research and Demonstration Program had recently begun operation, and a grant application was submitted and funded. As a result, a detailed study of learning resource usage was conducted over an 18-month period. During this time, it was very evident that traditional "library" service approaches were not effective for inner-city youth, and it was decided to extend the basic research/needs assessment into a multi-phased demonstration and evaluation of an alternative library.

Stage II lasted for approximately 18 months ending in mid-1972, and consisted primarily of planning and designing what would become the Action Library. The Planning Committee became the Interagency Committee; materials and education programs were designed in accordance with an evaluation design; ten target neighborhoods were reviewed for use as possible demonstration sites; and a program of community outreach and involvement was undertaken. The neighborhood eventually selected was populated by primarily black families, had crowded schools, and numerous substandard buildings. Of the approximately 4,400 primary and secondary students living in the area, 69 percent were from low income and AFDC[1] families. In terms of academic achievement, the area was ranked in the 80th percentile. There were no public library facilities. An intensive community outreach program was started to publicize the Action Library, to generate community support, and to locate a suitable facility. At this time, a Community Advisory Board was formed to review policy and maintain ongoing contact with the community. It is important to note that at this time the project sought and received an ESEA Title III grant which tended to: a) reinforce the need for community involvement, b) increase emphasis on formative and summative evaluation, and c) stress the need for active, aggressive dissemination. The evaluation design with its learning or product objectives, measures of progress, and management objectives served as the focal point for managing the project, developing curriculum and programs, and measuring usage and impact.

---

[1] Aid to Families with Dependent Children, a designation used by the Social Security Administration.

During this period, the facility was selected and the Action Library was staffed with library and education professionals and part-time community aides. Also, the project staff began collection-building activity, concentrating on black-oriented, easy reading, high interest materials.

The Action Library, the demonstration component of the project, was dedicated in March of 1972 by the USOE Commissioner of Education and began full-scale operation in June of the same year. During this stage of operation, lasting until June of 1974, the Action Library and Research Center engaged in a coordinated series of tasks to provide library experiences for the target population and to measure impact and progress in terms of the program operation and changes in participant attitudes and learning skills. For the first year, efforts concentrated on establishing the Action Library. During the second half of 1973 and early 1974, measurement of attitudes, attendance, participation, and circulation was initiated and certain data were contrasted with similar measures obtained using a control group.

In June of 1974, all Federal funding to support the Action Library and Research Center was stopped. The School District of Philadelphia assumed responsibility for the operation of the Action

Library and the Project Director was able to secure additional HEA II-B Library Research and Demonstration Program funds to complete the final report. The project was unable to complete the full cycle of evaluation during 1975, however. The Action Library is now closed, staff have moved on to other positions, and there is no evidence to suggest that any agency in Philadelphia will resume sponsorship of the project.

2.3: Staffing

Staffing was built around each of the project's two components, the Action Library and the Research Center, staffed by library and education professionals on the one hand, and program evaluation and publicity/outreach personnel on the other hand. Staff size and composition tended to vary over time. For example, during the first stage of the study, the staff consisted of researchers involved in needs assessment survey and analysis work, while during the last stage the staff represented librarians and researchers.

The Project Director was based in the Research Center along with an associate director, as many as five full-time evaluation, community outreach, and publicity personnel, one part-time systems analyst, two computer programmers, and as many as four consultants. The Action Library was staffed by a Director and five other professional librarians, reading specialists, special education teachers, and 20 part-time community aides. In addition, the project was required to retain an auditor to provide an independent assessment of the project. Staffing was adequate; in fact the project, relative to its size was richly staffed.

2.4: Problems

Over its history, the project encountered a series of problems varying in severity. One major problem cited by a number of the project's staff was funding, particularly the predictability of funding. While the project received an admittedly high degree of support, there were problems associated with actually receiving grant funds on a timely basis which in turn impacted the ability of the project to meet its payroll at certain points in time. A second, more significant funding problem, in the opinion of a number of persons, was the fact that HEA II-B Library Research and Demonstration funds were cut off very abruptly in 1974-75. The project expected to receive another grant, but was not informed that funding would stop until shortly before the end of the grant period. There was no opportunity to seek alternative funds.

The Community Advisory Board, while a key component of the total design, tended to have a negative impact on the project. This was due to the fact that the Chairperson of the Board often attempted to "run the project," in one instance circumvented the project staff, and hired relatives as community aides.

The community aides introduced a number of problems. First, difficulty in supervising the aides often manifested itself in the form of noisy backroom discussions. At times the community aides would screen materials selected by their neighbor's children under the assumption that they knew what was best for the child. Community aides also presented obstacles in measuring key progress and management objectives because of failure to record library transactions, attendance, and circulation in a diligent manner.

Support by the education community presented mixed problems. For the most part, classroom teachers were supportive of the project. School librarians were not supportive and, in the judgment of project staff, viewed the Action Library as a threat and a source of competition. Also, there are indications that staff within the research arm of the Philadelphia School District were of the opinion that they should have been responsible for the project's monitoring and evaluation.

There were problems in developing comparative measures of student gains because of difficulty in acquiring data from the various school districts and matching these data with project data. Finally, the project had great difficulty in reaching and involving teens and adults in the Action Library as users.

2.5: Relationship With Other Projects

The Philadelphia Student Library Resources Project had no formal or informal ties with other HEA II-B Library Research and Demonstration Program supported projects. Because the project received ESEA Title III Exemplary Education Program funds, it was part of that program's National Diffusion Network. The project was not involved in any library cooperatives or networks.

2.6: Dissemination

Dissemination was viewed as an integral part of the project design. Greater emphasis was placed on public relations than provision of information to agencies interested in replicating the project. Information was disseminated to sponsoring institutions and agencies, the target community, government leaders and library professionals, and the public. The purposes of the dissemination were to increase support for the project, increase awareness on the part of the target population, and to provide information and materials to facilitate replication and/or adaptation. Dissemination methods included mass mailing, preparation of specialized information, participation in broadcast media programs, and submission of materials and articles to professional journals and societies. Project staff presented papers at American Library Association meetings. Visits by representatives of outside agencies to the Action Library were also encouraged.

2.7: Project Evaluation

The evaluation design, built around some 70 product, process and management objectives, was, in the opinion of the Project Director, the key to the project's successful management. The evaluation design received increased emphasis as a result of ESEA Title III stress on this aspect of projects. The design incorporated numerous methods, including monitoring and analysis of usage data, surveys of participants and use of outside evaluators. Also, the project staff was in constant contact with participants and was able to collect evaluative information on an informal basis.

Use of an outside evaluator was prompted by the need to comply with ESEA Title III program requirements. This person, known as an auditor, provided assessments of the evaluation and education programs. Often these activities extended into areas not thought to be appropriate by project staff.

All project-developed evaluation tools were judged to be very useful to the project. In contrast, evaluation by USOE as represented by review of reports and site visits, was not judged to be useful.

2.8: Results/Key Findings

The results of the project and key findings are summarized below:

- The basic research conducted during Stage I to examine library usage and attitudes among urban students provided a very comprehensive data base on the subject. This data base is applicable to other metropolitan areas having similar populations and library characteristics.
- The cost of a demonstration project such as this is unrealistic for most school systems. This finding is predicated on the need to engage in comprehensive planning and evaluation; and, the problem of attempting to respond to community pressures to extend services.
- The Action Library was popular because of its unstructured program, highly skilled staff, collections, and ability to provide special learning programs.
- The Action Library, functioning as an alternative model, is a viable, affective approach for providing a solution to learning problems which characterize poor, urban areas. The annual cost of such a center is estimated to be $130,000.
- The project reinforced the belief that a well-defined management plan consisting of well-defined objectives and measurement of progress can be applied to libraries.
- While there was a significant effort to achieve interagency cooperation, all local agencies failed to provide funds to the project. Loss of Federal funds was accompanied by loss of substantial interest by the various agencies.
- Involvement of the community or target group in an advisory capacity and as active participants in the project's services was relatively successful and is important to such a program's overall success.

2.9: Impact and Replication of the Project

Impact as it relates to the Philadelphia Student Library Resources Project takes two forms: immediate short term impact on the target audience, and long term impact as an innovative demonstration capable of being replicated. The project's short term impact is summarized below:

- Students in the target population, especially those of elementary school age, used the Action Library intensively and extensively. In effect, it was shown that the gap between the potential users and library resources can be bridged using a highly specialized, richly staffed library.
- The project generated enthusiastic support in the community. Numerous agencies endorsed the project; very few were willing or able to provide financial support.

Replication of a project such as the Philadelphia Student Library Resources Project represents one of the most critical and absolute indicators of a demonstration project's success or failure. Considerable, extended interest in the project was shown by a number of agencies most likely to replicate it. According to project staff, ESEA Title III Federal program officials regarded the project as one of two projects funded during that period which were "worth" funding. When contrasted with attention given by USOE to other HEA II-B Library Research and Demonstration Projects, the Philadelphia project appears to have received an inordinate share. Despite this, the project has not been replicated, adopted, or adapted by other education or library agencies. Reasons for this include the high cost of implementing a service based on this project, the staffing required to provide comparable services, and the specialized nature of the project.

3: IMPACT OF THE HEA II-B LIBRARY RESEARCH AND DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM ON THIS PROJECT

This section presents comments by project staff and representatives of the Philadelphia School District, Philadelphia Archdiocese Schools, and Free Library about the role and impact of

HEA II-B Library Research and Demonstration Program vis-a-vis the project. It also presents views on policy, policy changes, and future directions.

3.1: Grant History

The Philadelphia Student Library Resources Project began as a study of student usage of libraries in Philadelphia's public, parochial, and private primary and secondary schools. Its initial funding, in 1968, was provided by the Philadelphia Institute. These funds were not adequate, and an application for $50,000 in HEA II-B Library Research and Demonstration Program funds was submitted, and approved so that a complete survey could be undertaken. The actual grantee was the Philadelphia School District which in turn contracted with what is now Government Studies and Systems, Inc. As a result of the research, it was decided that funds should be sought to demonstrate a model library program which might act as a solution to the problem of providing library services for inner-city youth.

Program officials at USOE were contacted, and USOE asked that a proposal be submitted requesting HEA II-B Library Research and Demonstration Program funds. Based on the proposal, USOE expressed a willingness to fund the establishment of such a model program and also fund its operation for a limited time. The proposal was funded, and during the period ending in 1972, the Action Library was designed and started up.

During the annual grant cycle preceding the first year of operation (1972), USOE indicated that it could not provide the total funding required to support the operation of the Action Library and Research Center. It is important to note here that Program staff were very interested in the project (according to a number of persons interviewed about the project) and anxious to support it. Program personnel contacted ESEA Title III Exemplary Education Program officials, and, as a result of a visit to the project by a representative of that office, a proposal requesting ESEA Title III funding was submitted and approved for

$600,000 over a two year period, 1972-1973 and 1973-1974. In the opinion of the project staff, the ESEA Title III funds were important but not significant. That is, the project was able to implement all components of its design and not have to resort to partial implementation. However, ESEA Title III program regulations required very specific evaluation and community involvement measures and these did have a significant impact on the project.

Even with the apparent abundance of funding, it was necessary to seek additional funds to pay the salaries of community aides. In 1972, a grant of $150,000 in LSCA I funds was requested from the Pennsylvania State Library Agency by the Free Library on behalf of the project. The grant request was approved.

The project continued to submit grant applications for HEA II-B Library Research and Demonstration grants each year and received an average of $300,000 per year through June of 1974. In May of 1974, USOE advised the project that it could not expect Program funds to support the Action Library during its third year of demonstration. In spite of this, the Project Director was able to secure approximately $120,000 in HEA II-B funds to complete the evaluation of the project and prepare a final report. To support the Action Library in 1975, the Project Director also secured five small private grants and matching funds from the Philadelphia School District (the District was ready to close the library but did not when other funds were obtained). This funding amounted to $115,000 and was used to support the Action Library; the Research Center's operations were halted in midstream. There was some hope that the Free Library would fund the Action Library, but this never happened because of cuts in staff and budget.

3.2: Monitoring and Technical Assistance

As is the case with all HEA II-B Library Research and Demonstration projects, Federal level monitoring was provided by USOE in Washington, D.C. Before discussing the projects' reactions to monitoring and technical assistance, it should be noted that the Philadelphia Student Library Resources Project attempted to establish a working relationship with the USOE Regional Program Officer, but there was little interest shown by the Regional Office. In contrast, the ESEA Title III officials at the Regional Office were involved extensively.

In the opinion of the project staff, USOE was very interested in the project. This is evidenced by the numerous visits made to the project, involvement of the Commissioner of Education in the dedication of the Action Library, active support of USOE in obtaining funding through other USOE programs, and careful review of reports and proposals.[1]

In its capacity as the monitoring agency, USOE impacted the project in a number of ways. For example, USOE questioned the heavy emphasis on African cultural history in terms of the Action Library's collection building, and the project reacted by modifying this emphasis. Also, at least one past official at USOE stressed the need for dissemination/publicity. This may have been an outgrowth of restrictions limiting USOE's role as an active disseminator. USOE officials made numerous visits to the project and would observe Community Advisory Board meetings and visit the Action Library. Project staff felt that site visits were the most effective monitoring technique. There was some criticism of Quarterly Progress Reports as being somewhat useless in that it was often difficult to provide useful discussions of measurable progress over such a short period of time. However, it was felt that they did provide some measure of accountability.

With regard to the proposal review/award process, reaction was mixed. On the one hand the proposal review process was seen as vigorous and thorough. On the other hand, a number of projects were selected to receive funding for more than one year, yet the annual grant proposal review seemed to ignore this fact.

---

[1] The project also worked with grant agencies other than what is now OLLR including: the Division of Plans and Supplementary Centers, Bureau of Elementary Education, USOE; the Pennsylvania State Library Agency; and the Philadelphia School District.

3.3: Perceptions of Present Policy and Recommendations for Future Changes

A number of observations about HEA II-B Library Research and Demonstration Program policy were made. With regard to funding, the current policy of awarding grants on a one year basis was severely criticized. This approach ignores the problem of long term management and evaluation; that is, the lag between implementation and effect. The absence of definite knowledge about the resources available to a project makes it difficult for the project staff to plan and move ahead with any degree of certainty that funding will be available to support future activities. A third problem with funding is that the Program attempts to spread its admittedly meager funds across too many areas simultaneously.

The Program was perceived as providing funds for research and demonstration which might otherwise have gone unfunded. The Program was also seen as focusing on national rather than local needs. The HEA II-B Library Research and Demonstration Program has not duplicated other research and demonstration efforts, and it was felt that the results of projects have been widely, though not effectively, disseminated. With regard to the Program's objectives, it was felt that OLLR has been most successful in the areas of library services, developing programs for special target groups, and developing new technologies, but has been less successful in the area of training of librarians.

Changes which the Program should consider include the following. First, the HEA II-B Library Research and Demonstration Program must increase its funding substantially--a ten-fold increase--if it is to have a real impact. The range of areas which are funded during a given period should be narrowed. Multi-year funding must be used. Also, the Program should reduce the number of esoteric and highly specialized projects it supports and concentrate more heavily on developing approaches to provide library resources to unserved areas.

It was also suggested that the Program reinstate its advisory committee. Reasons given for this include the need to increase awareness of the multitude of research and demonstration needs. The panel would provide the mechanism for setting priorities and program objectives which would more nearly represent national needs.

Although it was felt that project results are widely disseminated, this area needs more work at the Federal level. Although USOE utilizes ERIC, if the program is to have a greater impact, it must take a more active role in the dissemination of project results. The Philadelphia Student Library Resources Project proposed developing a dissemination package but it was not supported by USOE. Indeed, ineffective dissemination was seen as a very significant shortcoming of the program.

3.4: Evaluation and Conclusions

This case study of the Philadelphia Student Library Resources Project suggests a number of questions about the HEA II-B Library Research and Demonstration Program. These questions concern long term directions, impact on library and information sciences, and impact of projects on the setting in which they operate.

Results of interviews indicate that the Program was viewed as a source of external funding which would permit the principal education and library service agencies in Philadelphia to test an approach to alternative library services. In all probability, this test would not have been possible if the project's planners had to rely on local funding agencies. Second, the project was funded at a comparably high level, and this fact may have led to the development and implementation of what might be considered nonessential activities and functions.

Stated in another way, so long as the Federal government bore the cost of the project, local agencies were enthusiastic supporters of the project. When those funds were stopped, only token efforts were made to continue the project.

Turning to the project's relationship to research needs in library and information sciences, the following appears to have taken place. The project did demonstrate, though somewhat inconclusively since funding was stopped before the evaluation was completed, that an alternative library program such as the Action Library could impact inner-city youth. Yet, it has not been replicated so far as the Project Director is aware.

HEA II-B

LIBRARY RESEARCH AND DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM CASE STUDY

Project Title: Interrelating Library and Basic Education Services for Disadvantaged Adults: A Demonstration of Four Alternative Working Models

Project Director: George Eyster

Sponsoring Agency: Appalachian Adult Education Center
Morehead State University, Kentucky

Period of Performance: June 1972 - July 1975

Funding Amount:
1972-1973 - $267,107
1973-1974 - $252,418
1974-1975 - $108,008

Locations:
Birmingham, Alabama
Columbia, South Carolina
Floyd County, Kentucky
Cabell, Wayne, and Putnam Counties, West Virginia

1: INTRODUCTION

Adults can learn basic reading skills, but in the Appalachian region, there are few practical means available for practicing and developing newly learned skills. In 1972, a project, based at the Appalachian Adult Education Center (AAEC) at Morehead State University in Kentucky, was undertaken under an HEA Title II-B Library Research and Demonstration grant to develop resources for strengthening these skills. This was accomplished by coordinating the services of public library and adult education services, thereby upgrading both institutions.

The project was entitled Interrelating Library and Basic Education Services for Disadvantaged Adults: A Demonstration of Four Alternative Working Models (Alternative Models Project). It spanned three years, 1972-1974, during which time it was funded under the Library Research and Demonstration Component of HEA II-B. Subsequently, it received funds for three years as a training project from the HEA II-B Training Program. The initial year of the project was to develop and demonstrate four alternative models, and the succeeding years concentrated on replication, dissemination, and training. The project has produced a great deal of information about literacy programs in libraries, and its training programs have reached 77 sites in 10 States and over 2,000 professionals.

The AAEC project is no longer active, but many local agencies are utilizing its methods to promote their own, locally funded services. This case study report describes AAEC's activities during the period of time when it was funded under the library research and demonstration component of HEA II-B. Section 2 describes the design, procedures, problems and outcomes of the project. Section 3 explores the perceptions of the key project staff vis-a-vis the impact of the total HEA II-B Program on this project, and specifically, the role that HEA II-B Library Research and Demonstration Program requirements and management played in the conduct of the alternative models project.

2: HISTORY OF THE PROJECT

2.1: Objectives

The Appalachian Adult Education Center was established in 1967 to fight illiteracy in a rural, mountainous region of 13 States which is known as Appalachia. While focused on the individual as the ultimate beneficiary, the center has had to handle relationships and cross-jurisdictional questions involving different levels of government, special private agencies, and others. Thus, its staff was aware of the necessity for a broad range of input from as many participants as possible and the political realities of such interaction.

In keeping with its mission as a change agent for delivery of adult education, the AAEC has sponsored a great variety of demonstration projects using funds from a variety of Federal and State agencies. The attempt to increase the access to information of those adults who were enrolled in Adult Basic Education (ABE) through the combined services of public libraries and public schools was the focus of the research and demonstration project funded by HEA II-B in 1972-1975.

2.2: Methodology

Based upon the position that personal independence is the long-term goal of educational offerings to the disadvantaged, the AAEC undertook the Alternative Models Project to test the assumption that coordination of basic education and library services could contribute more toward personal independence than either could furnish in isolation. Little coordination had occurred naturally, resulting in the duplication of some activities and the neglect of others. The AAEC demonstrations were designed to tackle four major problem areas in coordination: organization, personnel, programs, and materials. The four models are described below.

Site	Design	Experimental Facets
Birmingham, Alabama	Urban Library to ABE	family learning center in library service to adults in jail
Columbia, South Carolina	Urban ABE to Library	cooperation with school libraries service to adults in mental institutions book talks aimed at human problems use of nonprint by ABE students
Floyd County, Kentucky	Rural ABE to Library	bookmobile service to ABE clients mail service to ABE clients
Cabell, Wayne, and Putnam Counties, West Virginia	Rural Library to ABE	adjustment of bookmobile and library hours for ABE clients free bus service to library provided by CAP

Planning and development activities began in December 1971 and the project became operational in June 1972. Each of the four centers was developed with AAEC and local staff cooperating to meet the localized needs of the population. To aid the centers, the AAEC developed bibliographies of materials for both Life Coping Skills and Leisure Reading. The AAEC also developed an orientation kit.

Major activities in the project included development of reader's (student) profiles, assessment of materials for each skill area, delivery of materials to students which were selected on the basis of those profiles, and development of community agency referral handbooks.

2.3: Staffing

The staff for this project was relatively large. This is because there was a large time investment in training. Also, at each of the demonstration sites there was a full-time librarian and a full-time secretary. Other staff included three administrators and a librarian in addition to the four at the demonstration sites. Over a period of three years the project utilized over 100 persons to administer and operate the project and provide training. There were also three paraprofessionals, paid by the Right to Read program, who worked with the project.

2.4: Problems

The Project Director saw only the lack of funding as a significant problem. Another person involved in the project mentioned that trying to locate intended beneficiaries at the local sites was a problem. Neither of these impacted seriously on the outcome of the project, although the lack of funds did hamper the rate of progress to some extent.

2.5: Relationship to Other Projects

The AAEC has working relationships with other projects in many areas, and encourages these ties wherever possible. There were no formal or informal relationships established with other HEA II-B Library Research and Demonstration sponsored projects which were directly related to this project, but the goal of the Alternative Models project was to promote cooperation and coordination among institutions. One person with the project mentioned that the program consisted of getting materials concerning coping skills directly into the libraries; as opposed to having materials available through either interlibrary loan or through a library cooperative.

2.6: Dissemination

There has been a great deal of dissemination of information about this project. Dissemination as a component of the project was included in the initial year funding request, but was postponed. Of great value for the purpose of dissemination was the fact that so many agencies, jurisdictions and individuals were involved including the American Library Association, State Library Associations, UNESCO, library science schools and State adult education departments. Library leaders aided in the development of ways of disseminating materials to a wide range of librarians.

2.7: Project Evaluation

In addition to a complete internal evaluation system, the Project Director feels that the opportunity for evaluation was available to and was used by the intended beneficiaries, project staff, sponsoring agency, Office of Education, three Regional Program Officers in the Appalachian area, and an outside evaluator. These evaluations resulted in several changes: the scope of the project was expanded to include the development of training procedures and materials, a wider variety of resources was used, and many new resources were actually developed.

2.8: Results/Key Findings

The experience gained in project activities showed that coordination and cooperation between public schools and public libraries for services to disadvantaged adults can be effected within a matter of months; material assessment and selection by coping skill area are much needed and useful for both adult education and libraries.

One of the most important results of this project was the catalytic effect it had on library/ABE relationships at the State and local levels.[1/] For example, at the time that AAEC began, only one State Librarian was working with the State's Director of Adult Education; now there are at least the seeds of cooperation in all four States involved in the project.

[1/] Appalachian Adult Education Center, Interrelating Library and Basic Education Services for Disadvantaged Adults: A Demonstration of Four Alternative Working Models: Annual Report; Volume 1; 1973; p. 58.

2.9: Impact of the Project

The project reached a large number of people: there was training at 77 sites in 10 States. There were 2,006 participants including 936 librarians from 175 libraries and 1,070 non-librarians (842 social service agencies and 228 Adult Basic Education staff, teachers and clients). Also a wide range of training materials were produced which are distributed through the American Library Association. Similar projects were initiated. The project generated a handbook called Literacy and the Nation's Libraries. The project also encouraged more effective communication between libraries and community organizations.

The director of the ABE program in Birmingham spoke about the effect of the project on users of the service. "Enrollment has increased, also materials, [and] we are better equipped. Facilities have increased, staff has increased. Most learners are here for GED. They are basically bettering themselves in home and jobs." A library director said that "it literally changed their lives."

The Project Director feels that the project met its objectives better than expected in the following ways: leadership was able to develop; methods were developed whereby community involvement which cut across agency lines was made possible; there was support from the library and adult education fields; and because the center had an international reputation (recipient of UNESCO prize in International Library Competition), the project was credible. This enabled it to work with and among officials.

2.10: Replication

The project was very much oriented to replication. The initial year's funding was for a demonstration of four alternative working models. After that there was essentially the application of knowledge gained from these models. When asked about replication, the Project Director mentioned specific items which the project developed for assisting others interested in replication. Some directive materials which address 26 problems serve as library service guides and are used in training programs. Numerous workshops were held which discussed the project, its findings, and the possible methods for use in assisting disadvanted adults in libraries. The project also supplied technical assistance to most of the States involved in the project. The project had a large demonstration component and findings based on these activities were that every demonstration project should have: sanction for total dissemination and a method for reporting results of a dissemination [equivalent to the State Facilitator concept used in the ESSA Title III Secondary Education Program].

3: THE EFFECTS OF HEA II-B LIBRARY RESEARCH AND DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM ON THE PROJECT

This section describes the perceptions of the key project staff, particularly the Project Director, toward the administration of HEA II-B Library Research and Demonstration grants, and its effect on project outcomes. The section begins with a description of the process by which the grant was submitted, discusses the funding and decisionmaking in this HEA II-B Program and the role of the Federal Government in monitoring and assistance.

3.1: Grant History

The history of funding for the AAEC is far different from many other recipients of HEA II-B Research and Demonstration Program projects. The Alternative Working Models project was one of several programs underway at any given time at the Center. Seed money for the Center's operating expenses was provided by the Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education, U.S. Office of Education. As part of the original proposal, it was planned that the remainder of the funds would come from other Federal sources or State and local sources. Thus, the Alternative Models project was one component of a complex, multi-faceted organization. The Alternative Working

Models project was a separate component in the AAEC plan. Thus, it had its own objectives, procedures, staff, etc., but it did benefit from the AAEC plan in that extra staff were supplied with funding from other grants, and it did mesh with AAEC goals. The first HEA II-B Library Research and Demonstration grant was awarded in 1972, and continued for three years.

3.2: Monitoring and Technical Assistance

Project monitoring from Federal officials has been fairly regular and frequent for this project, and has had important impact on the project's direction, especially in the areas of coordination, problems, resource allocation, and evaluation. Technical assistance, too, has been readily available, albeit more informal than monitoring. In each case, the Project Director rated the Federal participation as very useful to the project.

3.3: Perceptions of Policy and Recommendations for Changes

In addition to the Right to Read program, other funds for this program were received from the visiting nurse program, States, individual libraries, and other agencies. Generally, this project, rather than requiring additional funds from the participating libraries, actually needed a redistribution of the present funds. This redistribution was to be directed toward acquiring material which was more directed toward serving the population target subgroup of adults improving their reading skills.

The Project Director was asked about the relative proportion of funds which should be distributed to research and to demonstration. His response was that it was a "bureaucratic question." When asked to expand on this, specifically about priorities and directions for the Library Research and Demonstration Component of HEA II-B, he commented that the "professional community has ample opportunity to influence the directions." The Project Director feels that programs should be funded for more than one year. "Annual funding is detrimental to sound research." He feels that having sufficient time to prepare grant applications is very important. It brings more people into the process than just "professional grantsmen. Give them at least time." Another person involved with the project commented that "you can't bring about behavioral change in one year. Two years is a minimum. Three is good. If you can't do it in four years you should get out." The Project Director expressed the opinion that if a project has involved the whole community in its activities and has gathered enough information to develop a good proposal, then even if it does not receive funding, the project may carry on anyway. This seemed to be true at one site. In Birmingham, when the Federal funds ceased, the program was picked up for a small amount of money by the city and county. Now two cities, two counties, and one library are involved in funding the program.

3.4: Future Directions

Concerning how the Program can be improved at the Federal level the Project Director commented that "more leadership with flexibility to monitor projects" would be an improvement. This is also reflected in his opinion that the written reports, oral reports and site visits were all very useful to him in managing the project. Another comment was that the Office of Education needs a clear picture of the entire dissemination process. It does not know how to disseminate information. In contrast there was a great deal of personal dissemination on this project. Materials were readily available which were designed for special purposes.

HEA II-B

LIBRARY RESEARCH AND DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM CASE STUDY

Project Title:	Development of Criteria for the Implementation and Establishment of a Neighborhood Information Center in Five Public Libraries in Five Cities: Atlanta, Cleveland, Detroit, Houston, and Queensborough (New York City)
Project Director(s):	William Curley and Dorothy Ann Turick, Cleveland Public Library David M. Hennington, Houston Public Library
Sponsoring Agency:	Atlanta Public Library Cleveland Public Library Detroit Public Library Houston Public Library Queensborough Public Library
Period of Performance:	July 1972 - July 1975
Funding Amount:	1972-1973 - $324,000 1973-1974 - $319,824 1974-1975 - $235,000
Locations:	Atlanta, Georgia Cleveland, Ohio Detroit, Michigan Houston, Texas Queensborough, New York

1: INTRODUCTION

Public libraries may be viewed as a uniquely appropriate source of local information and referral services, especially among existing agencies. Library staffs are skilled information gatherers; libraries are often located conveniently; the library clientele represent the jurisdiction's residents; and the library is a rich resource of print and non-print materials that meet many of the needs for information and referral services. In 1972, with funding under the HEA II-B Research and Demonstration Program, a consortium of five public libraries was established to research the feasibility of utilizing branch libraries as neighborhood information centers.

Originally the project, known as the Neighborhood Information Center (NIC) Project, was envisioned as a one-year research and planning project; it was eventually funded for three years. The Cleveland Public Library was originally responsible for monitoring and coordination among the five libraries. The Houston Public Library assumed that role in July 1974. Other sites were Detroit, Atlanta, and Queensborough. The project was funded for $879,000.

This report is based on the results of visits to three of the five sites: Houston, Atlanta, and Detroit.[1] Upon consultation with the Houston Public Library Project Director and most recent director of the project, these three sites were selected because, in the balance, they appeared to give the most comprehensive understanding of the project. This report presents observations of each site as part of the consortium project. That is, the Neighborhood Information Center Project is the topic of discussion, and observations at the individual site are brought in where germane to the discussion. Section 2 describes the project and its sites, with attention to objectives, methodology, findings, and problems encountered. Section 3 discusses participants' reaction to the role that the HEA II-B Library Research and Demonstration Program played in the conduct of this project.

---

[1] Additional background information was obtained from: Childers, Thomas, Final Summary Report: Third Year Continuation of a Research and Design Criterion for the Implementation and Establishment of a Neighborhood Information Center in Five Public Libraries, Houston: November 1975.

2: HISTORY OF THE PROJECT

In 1971 the U.S. Office of Education became interested in the concept of Neighborhood Information Centers as a means of providing the services of information and referral through public libraries. A meeting was held with the library directors at Queensborough (New York), Cleveland (Ohio), and Detroit (Michigan). It was the concensus of the participants that a pilot study for the design of a Neighborhood Information Center be started. A consortium among these three libraries, plus those of Atlanta (Georgia) and Houston (Texas), was established, and funding was requested under the Library Research and Demonstration Component of Title II-B of the Higher Education Act. The Director of the Cleveland Public Library together with the Deputy Director of the Detroit Public Library designed the project. Although each member of the consortium was responsible for and largely autonomous in the implementation of the project, Cleveland was designated as the monitor and facilitator of the project on a national basis.

2.1: Objectives

The objectives of the Neighborhood Information Center Project were to:

- Demonstrate to neighborhood residents and the community at large that the urban public library can be a vital force in daily living, will provide free information, will refer residents to additional sources for information and assistance, and that the library can adapt in non-traditional ways to those who have not used library services; and
- Provide survival information or referral information assistance to people who may be in lower income brackets who may have little or limited education.

2.2: Methodology

The project consisted of the following phases:

Phase I	-	Each site conducted a feasibility study to assess its community's information needs, availability of information, established information and referral services, the library's desired role in providing information and referral services, and the readiness of the library to assume that role.

Phase II - Cleveland was responsible for developing the broad criteria and guidelines for implementing neighborhood information centers. During this phase, the following were planned/completed:

- review criteria and guidelines,
- train staff,
- hold national seminars,
- re-examine and refine decisions made during first year of project,
- recommend extension and adaptation of project to other cities,
- disseminate information and research findings,
- maintain liaison with officials, with State, National and regional library associations, State Library Agencies, graduate schools, and research centers.

Phase III - Actual implementation took place in each city that established neighborhood information centers in library branches. This phase was given extensions, allowing a total of 2-1/2 years of funded implementation in some cities.

The service concepts ultimately implemented in the three sites visited are described for each site in the sections that follow.

Houston Public Library

The primary objective of the Houston Neighborhood Information Center (NIC) was to provide steering and referral for any problem or question that a user may have. The services of the NIC also went beyond referral to actual provision of such services as Internal Revenue Service Workshops and blood pressure tests.

In Houston, the NIC services were decentralized. Each branch functioned as an independent unit to be as flexible as possible in reflecting the needs of the particular neighborhood in which each was located. However, without adequate coordination, branch libraries varied greatly in the kinds and effectiveness of their programs. There had been little training prior to the opening of the centers, and many of the staff were unsure of their functions. Branch libraries also varied in their commitment to the NIC concept, although the central library administration remained supportive of the project.

Presently, 18 branches are actively involved in the Neighborhood Information Center Project, and one staff member at each site is designated as an NIC specialist. The project has maintained good relations with the social service agencies and governmental institutions in the city, which facilitates referral to these agencies. When an NIC specialist determines that an agency has not been responsive to the needs of a client, future referrals to that agency are curtailed. The NIC specialist keeps records of the kinds of services requested, and makes strong efforts to keep the referral files updated. Although a large number of inquiries come from disadvantaged groups, the NIC has served the needs of individuals from all walks of life in Houston. Recently information and referral services were made available in Spanish.

Atlanta Public Library

The Neighborhood Information Center Project in Atlanta was designed to help people obtain the resources they need for coping with everyday life. Within that broad scope, the target clientele of the services is not well defined. Different staff members have interpreted Atlanta's NIC mission in various ways: some saw it primarily for the disadvantaged, others wished to see the NIC serve all residents; some saw advocacy as their mission, while others did not.

The services provided by the NIC included transitional information and referral activities, and some services of a less traditional nature such as voter registration, availability of notary public services, and an Adult Reading Development program. The original plan had been to build several components into the NIC service to allow it to serve as the central information service in Atlanta. These components would have included: a Government Information Center, Telephone Ready Reference (a service offered by many libraries), the NIC concept, an Integrated Information Service that would compile local information in a computer accessible format, and a computerized Educational Options File that would compile information of educational opportunities in Atlanta.

Currently, about one-third of these calls are NIC related. Information and referral is currently one of the fastest growing services in the library system. Voter registration has continued as an NIC service, and free notary public service is available in all library branches. Voter registration is available at all branches, and librarians are sent into nursing homes, shopping centers, etc. for registration as well. NIC also maintains a clipping file of social agencies in the city of Atlanta as well as a clipping file of grass roots organizations in branch library neighborhoods. Services are provided by professional staff members who are trained in information and referral.

Detroit Public Library

It was the experience of the Detroit Public Library in establishing the concept of neighborhood information centers that gave the impetus to the current National project. TIP (The Information Place) as it was known in Detroit was the strongest and most comprehensive of the NIC efforts in this project. Preliminary work began in 1971 before Federal funding, and since 1973, this service has been included in all the library branches as well as in the Main Library. In fact, the Director of Libraries, noted that:

> ...for better, for worse; for richer, for poorer... We have made a commitment at the Detroit Public Library to information and referral service. The Federal grant for the five cities consortium advanced our efforts greatly, and the regular contact between the five cities was beneficial to all.

Much of the reason for the project grew out of the drastic changes in the library population the Detroit Public Library was serving. There was a great migration to the suburbs by white middle class families, the inner-city residents were often "non-readers" in the traditional sense. But even among the more affluent patrons, the demands upon the library began to change. According to the Director,

> There was an increasing need for guidance through the maze of social, legal, governmental and other agencies, regardless of socioeconomic class. Social agencies have tried to develop information and referral for their clientele, but the necessary reference skills in organizing information are not part of their discipline, limiting their ability to answer this need. Also, their institutions are independent, highly diversified operations that are not called upon to function as a unit, as public libraries do.

In the beginning, various librarians gave as much time as they could spare, here and there, to start the central information and referral file with information, materials, and assistance from the library's Sociology and Economics Department. According to the Director, it took more than a year and a half to compile a respectable resource file. With the coming of Federal funds from the HEA Title II-B Research and Demonstration Program, two full-time librarians and a clerk were allocated to staff the project. In November 1972 service was opened in one branch and in January 1973, in a second. According to the library staff, this method of building information and referral files was too tedious and lengthy to include the 29 community branches. Every branch received a copy of the central information and referral file in a four-drawer cabinet. The TIP staff (including two part-time social worker-consultants by this time) planned a series of workshops for branch librarians for instruction and orientation. This was preparatory to launching TIP service simultaneously in all branches. The workshops were well received, but implementation was not immediate. Each branch had to add to its copy of the central information and referral file information on the immediate community. This required "community walks" to gather information from businesses, block clubs, churches, institutions, key individuals, etc. With each contact, librarians publicized all of the services of the library, and groups were invited into the branch library auditoriums for meetings. It is very important to emphasize that the Director of Libraries saw, and continues to see, information and referral as an integrated part of library reference service.

Throughout its first years, the Director of Libraries quieted any fears staff might have about the program by workshops, site visits, etc. The Chief of Branches was important in contributing to the project success by displaying a positive and receptive attitude. But perhaps most important, TIP was portrayed as a fully incorporated part of regular library service, not a separate project. Therefore all staff members were involved in providing the service.

During the beginning of the project (1973), a prominent advertising firm donated publicity for a 30 day period. Billboards around the city were donated to advertise TIP's service in bold red letters. Placecards were put in public buses, handbills were distributed, spot announcements were aired on radio and television, and newspapers gave excellent coverage.

Cooperation was established with the Community Information Center at United Community Services headquarters. The large Wayne County Social Services Department was another key contact in reaching great numbers of people with the message that practical help was available through TIP.

Every branch library now functions as its neighborhood's information center, and the response by both the public and human service providers has been excellent according to the library staff. Using the library's total informational resources, as well as the newly developed community informational file, the libraries use their traditional library skills of listening to and interpreting people's informational needs so that they can direct them to essential human services or any other information and/or services desired.

The Detroit Public Library's information and referral service involves two separate functions, each requiring different skills and expertise. The first is information development; the second is information delivery. For this reason, the TIP service is organized with a Central Clearinghouse to develop information and with decentralized branch outlets to deliver information. There is also a central, citywide telephone and walk-in service located in the Main Library which is complemented by the collections of that institution and the expertise of its reference departments.

2.3: Staffing

In observing the workings of each of the three sites one obvious factor in the success of a personalized service, such as NIC activities, was the staffing which requires adequate support, proper management, and individual commitment to the task. This can be seen by comparing the staffing patterns among the three cities.

Houston

In Houston, one staff member at each NIC was designated as an NIC specialist. Of these specialists, one-third had professional library degrees, and two-thirds had degrees in fields such as social work, and two individuals were working toward advanced degrees. It was the duty of the NIC specialists to provide services for patrons seeking information and referral assistance, but they might also be called upon to assist in regular library duties such as reader advisory service, circulation, etc. Many specialists viewed this as a double assignment and voiced dissatisfaction to the NIC coordinator. Another staffing problem was that the promotional system does not allow for upgrading of positions within the structure of the NIC project. Upon promotion to Librarian II, an NIC staff person was no longer eligible for employment with the project, resulting in high turnover.

Atlanta

Atlanta's staffing problem stemmed from dissension between the first NIC Director and the library staff. This dissension developed because the Director was considered by librarians to have insufficient professional qualifications. In addition, several other conflicts arose in relation to the administrative support of the project, and in 1973, the NIC Director resigned, taking most of the NIC staff with her. As a result there was a breakdown in the ability to plan and carry out adequate information and referral services. Effects of this incident were noticeable when the site visit was conducted four years later. Many of the library staff believed that the NIC project had been forced upon them by the Library Director. Staff had not been involved in the initial stages. Throughout the life of the project, there was little or no staff input.

Detroit

Detroit displays a very different staffing pattern from either of the other two cities. Information and referral has been given top priority at the highest administrative level. Administrative commitment has been an integral part of the service rather than peripheral, and has manifested itself in four major ways: high levels of leadership, allocation of funds, educational workshops, and orientation of the entire staff.

Initial control and guidance of the resource clearinghouse, branch heads, and their perspective staffs were monitored outside the basic administrative hierarchy. All persons involved reported directly to the Deputy Director of the Detroit Public Library, who was delegated information and referral as a major responsibility. With the advent of Federal funding, weekly meetings were held with test site staff, with a view toward refining skills needed for effective service and acquiring in-depth knowledge of agency and organizational services. Over the last three years there has been some degree of integration and institutionalization within the traditional library context. Information and referral has now been established as a department in its own right, and monitoring has been transferred to the Associate Director for Public Service.

2.4: Problems

Staffing was a serious problem encountered at several of the sites. Funding and coordination were two other problems which tended to hamper the effectiveness of the implementation of the NIC concept. In Cleveland (not visited), for example, the delay in approval of funding by USOE for the third year forced the project into a one year hiatus. More importantly, it was necessary to shift the role of National coordinator from Cleveland to Detroit.

2.5: Evaluation

In addition to local monitoring and management, in 1974 the Neighborhood Information Center Project retained an outside consultant to conduct a final evaluation of the National Project, including a review of project files, site visits, and survey of social agencies and library clientele in the site locations.

Periodic evaluations were used to examine the scope of each local project and certain methodological approaches. For example, the Houston project discovered that most of its service requests were received over the telephone rather than in person as had been anticipated due to poor public transportation.

2.6: Dissemination

Dissemination of information about the Neighborhood Information Center has been extensive, covering all types of communication vehicles. However, a major emphasis of each NIC was publicity about its services. Dissemination was central to the NIC concept, allowing it to obtain clients and create linkages with agencies that can serve those clients.

2.7: Results/Key Findings

The Neighborhood Information Center concept had its beginning in five cities in the United States. It is continuing in all five sites to some extent, and even those projects in Atlanta and Houston that have had problems are hopeful that the future of the projects holds a good deal of potential. What the comparative history of the three projects described above shows to organizations interested in replication is that a concept and a plan for human services delivery integrated within a library agency requires a great deal of involvement and commitment from the intended staff. The community will generate a high level of demand for this service, and the agency must be prepared to deliver.

2.8: Impact/Replication

One of the results of the consortium approach has been to illustrate the replication potentials of the NIC concept. The final report contained a blueprint for staff structure and workshops for training. In Houston, a local organization of information and referral agencies was formed, providing a better way to collect information and dispense it and enabling the NIC's there to work better with other agencies, according to the current Principal Investigator.

The overall impact of the Neighborhood Information Center Project is perceived by the Principal Investigator to be moderate, but there are specific neighborhoods on which it has had significant impact. It was strongly felt, by most of the respondents, that the NIC concept is very important. At the three sites visited the feeling was that the administrators were committed to the program, and both Atlanta and Houston voiced hopes that their programs would overcome difficulties.

Although the Houston project started out with a weak organizational and procedural structure and it has been hampered by limited funds and staff, the library administration has made a strong commitment to continue the services. The Director does not view the relatively small expansion of the services of the project as a negative factor; he maintains that the project was conceived to be small from the onset. An NIC coordinator has recently been appointed who has had extensive experience in working with similar projects. The Library Director believes that with her strong coordination and expertise, the Houston NIC project will become better organized and its services more extensive. She also believes that the new coordinator will provide the guidance to the library staff to break down the problem of conflict of roles as is articulated by some present staff members and NIC specialists.

In Atlanta, the present Library Director has made strong efforts to resurrect the project. She believes that the project can be innovative and greatly expanded. She has many excellent ideas about additional NIC services such as information and referral services for inmates at the county jail. This will include writing and reading skills, legal studies, typing, etc., and it will be headed by a professional librarian and funded from the library budget. Because of previous experience in information and referral, the Library Director can carry out her objectives if she can overcome some of the serious political problems of budget control the Atlanta Public Library experiences.

In Detroit, the NIC has become an established part of the library service.

3: IMPACT OF THE HEA II-B LIBRARY RESEARCH AND DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM ON THIS PROJECT

As was mentioned earlier, the concept of Neighborhood Information Centers predated Federal funding, but the availability of HEA II-B Library Research and Demonstration Program funds enabled the NIC's to be implemented in the five consortium member cities. This section summarizes the perceptions of key staff as to the role that this HEA II-B Program has played in the development of the Project.

3.1: Grant History

The Neighborhood Information Center Project was funded for $324,000 under the first proposal it submitted in 1972. This proposal was submitted upon the suggestion of a USOE representative at a meeting held with three members of the eventual consortium. Later extensions to the grant were awarded: $319,824 in 1973 and $235,000 in 1974.

3.2: Monitoring and Technical Assistance

The Project Director at Houston reported that quarterly reports were sent to USOE, and oral reports were made monthly. Both were considered useful activities. Two site visits were conducted by the Program Officer over the course of the three-year project. These were moderately useful. One former Project Director (in Cleveland) reported that areas of discussion with Federal officials were limited to Federal policy, technical issues, problems, and financial decisions. By contrast, the Project Director at Houston reported having discussions on almost every aspect of the project, including planning, allocation of resources, locating of additional resources and cutbacks/extensions of activities in addition to those mentioned by his predecessor. Contacts in all areas reportedly helped to make changes in the project.

Technical assistance was received by the project from Federal officials less frequently than monitoring activities and was considered only occasionally helpful. The assistance provided by the Project Officer was considered very good, and the present Project Director in Houston found the assistance provided by the sponsoring agencies to be good as well. The former Director felt the sponsoring agencies did not provide adequate assistance. Technical assistance was reported to have assisted in changes to: the project scope, objectives, methodology, utilization of resources, staff, and schedules.

3.3: Perceptions of Policy and Recommendations for Changes

Both Project Directors felt that the HEA II-B Library Research and Demonstration Program has funded projects that have been responsive to critical needs. They do not feel, however, that the results of such research have received adequate attention. The Program is considered to be fairly successful in meeting its objectives. Funding should be increased 100 to 200 percent and be divided between large and small grants. The Project Director in Houston favors an even split between research and demonstration projects, while the former Project Director in Cleveland favored giving demonstration 75 percent of available funds.

The Project Director in Houston felt that projects should be required to re-apply for funds each year to allow results to be reassessed and to make more money available. Neither Project Director had extensive comments about proposal review or the Advisory Panel.

HEA II-B

LIBRARY RESEARCH AND DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM CASE STUDY

Project Title:	Development of a Computerized Regional Library System
Project Director:	Frederick G. Kilgour
Sponsoring Agency:	Ohio College Library Center
Period of Performance:	July 1971 - December 1972
Funding Amount:	$125,000
Location:	Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio

1: INTRODUCTION

The purpose of the Ohio College Library Center (OCLC) project was to further the design of a computerized, on-line regional library system. OCLC's Board of Trustees and staff were firmly convinced that the needs of libraries could be met through the concept of an on-line catalog program. Demonstration of the workability of this concept required more funds than the participants could provide, thus an HEA II-B Library Research and Demonstration grant was sought and obtained. This project addressed the need to utilize computer technology to increase library staff productivity. It falls into the "networking" category of HEA II-B Library Research and Demonstration projects. The project selected for study was conducted July 1, 1971 to December 31, 1972 in Columbus, Ohio by Fred Kilgour, Executive Director of OCLC, a non profit corporation.

OCLC's impact is phenomenal. In 1977, over 1,000 libraries across the nation participate in the OCLC on-line system. Because OCLC provides access through intermediary networks, it has stimulated the development of State and multistate networks that work on additional aspects of sharing library and information resources.

This report presents a history of the project, its relationship with the HEA II-B Library Research and Demonstration Program, its relationship with members and the State Library Agency, and views of key staff on the future of networking and future directions of the HEA II-B Library Research and Demonstration Program. The last section of the report contains an assessment by the researchers.

2: HISTORY OF THE PROJECT

2.1: Project Objectives

The principal service objective of the Ohio College Library Center (OCLC) is to increase the availability of library resources for users of participating libraries; the principal economic goal is to lower the rate of per-unit library costs while increasing availability of library resources. The system designed to achieve OCLC's objectives is a computerized, on-line file of bibliographic information located in Columbus, Ohio.

The overall design for the OCLC on-line system provides for six subsystems: 1) on-line union catalog and shared cataloging, 2) serials control, 3) acquisitions (technical processing), 4) interlibrary loan communications, 5) remote catalog access and circulation control, and 6) retrieval by subject. The objective for the project was to begin developmental work on two subsystems: serials control and acquisitions.

Several groups were involved in defining the objectives for this project. A major group was the Ohio College Association (OCA) for the presidents of Ohio colleges and universities that initially established OCLC in July 1967. Others involved in defining the objectives for the project were researchers, advisory boards, outside consultants, the State government, academic librarians, and the Project Director.

2.2: Methodology and Chronology[1]

In the first week of July 1971, the beginning of the grant period being studied, OCLC activated a prototype, on-line system for instructional purposes. On August 27, 1971, Ohio State University began using the on-line union catalog and shared cataloging system. In the following one and one-half months the remaining 48 Ohio members plus the Pittsburgh Regional Library Center began using the system.

The OCLC system is designed so that there will be only one file of bibliographic records used in cataloging, serials control, acquisitions, circulation, and information retrieval subsystems. Elaboration of the on-line cataloging system enhanced the activation of the serials control and the technical processing system, but development of these subsystems was delayed.

---

[1] This section is based on the Final Report for the Project: Kilgour, Frederick G., and Hills D. Davis, Comps., The Development of a Computerized Regional Library System, Final Report, ED 080 117, June 1973.

During the period being studied, the OCLC staff spent considerable time re-designing, coding, and implementing the on-line programs so that they would be hospitable to the introduction of major new subsystems such as serials and acquisitions. The major effort and accomplishment occurred in the cataloging subsystem. OCLC added over a dozen new functions such as the initiation of input cataloging and update and reformat functions. By the end of the grant period progress was made in other areas:

- Design of an on-line serials control system was complete for on-line check in, on-line union catalog, input serials cataloging, production of catalog cards, automatic claiming, and binding reports, and
- The acquisitions system was sufficiently well designed so that a programming staff could undertake on-line development.

In addition, OCLC extended its services to five other regions on an experimental or operational basis, and a dozen other regions had discussed with OCLC the possibility of replication or extension of service from Columbus.

2.3: Staffing

The project staff consisted of one principal investigator, (half-time), four senior programmers, one systems analyst/programmer, one programmer editor (all full-time), a clerical person (one-quarter time), three consultants at ten days each, and the five members of the Advisory Committee at six days each. The Associate Director judged that the manpower estimates were adequate.

2.4: Problems

According to respondents, the project encountered no major problems. Finding appropriate facilities was a slight problem. Delays in the schedule occurred because terminals did not arrive as scheduled and activation of the telephone network was delayed. Although the order for the network had been placed with AT&T in November 1970 with the target date for full operation on July 1, 1971, OCLC was unable to use the telephone network until mid-August 1972. Even then, not all libraries had an operational connection.

At one point, USOE questioned whether grant funds were being used to subsidize catalog production. To settle the question, OCLC called in Haskin & Sells, Certified Public Accountants, to review OCLC's costing procedures. Haskin & Sells found that all direct costs were included in the card costing and that USOE funds were not being used to subsidize operations.

The librarians interviewed at four locations where OCLC is used or used within the next year reported no major problems. The Ohio public library visited has not yet begun using OCLC and had not encountered any serious problems in preparing to begin the service. The Assistant Librarian for Technical Services at an Ohio university that had been a charter member of OCLC reported no major problems. However, he did feel that OCLC in the beginning may have had some difficulty in assessing needs. Many of the members thought that the serious program should be developed before the cataloging system. The head librarian of an Ohio college reported that librarians at the college did not like using the terminal and that response time was not what they would like it to be.

The network Director who was interviewed also reported no major problems, but some problems did exist. Because the network began to use OCLC services in 1975, about two and one-half years after the end of the period being studied, his assessment indicates the area of problems encountered by subsequent users. The problems fall into two areas: those internal to the network organization and those more closely related to the area of OCLC's responsibility. One internal problem was that the network lacks funding to do research on topics such as cooperative collection development of concern to member libraries, and the network lacks funds for an office terminal. A second problem was that staff were not appropriate to their tasks. However, this problem lessened as the staff became more familiar with OCLC procedures and operations. A third internal problem was the difficulty of evaluating progress. A fourth problem concerned the network's relationship to the procedural requirements of the sponsoring agency of a higher education consortium of which the network is a component. On occasion this hinders operations of the network. Policy matters have to be authorized by the consortium. The consortium also administers the accounts; and in the beginning, they lacked experience with accounting procedures needed to bill member libraries for OCLC series.

The second set of problems are those more directly under OCLC's control. The first problem is that some basic OCLC publications on the system are out-of-date. Furthermore, the documentation on the system is insufficient and incomplete. A second problem is that OCLC did not provide any well-defined guidance for administering a network in areas such as contracts or billing procedures. The third problem is that OCLC requests information with unrealistic deadlines that the network office must solicit from member libraries. A fourth problem mentioned by many of the network members is that of insufficient opportunity to participate in decisionmaking related to OCLC matters.

Many of the concerns expressed by the network Director are reflected in a recent article assessing OCLC's overall impact from a managerial viewpoint. Stevens[1/] acknowledges the many achievements of OCLC and identifies five unresolved concerns with the management of OCLC: lack of competition and, thus, no incentives to develop alternative techniques; poor relationships with multistate and State networks; problems with the on-line system; unmet schedules; and unexplained rate increases. Two major reasons he identifies for the above difficulties are the lack of appropriate goals and objectives and firm priorities and the lack of any effective voice in the control of OCLC for the multistate and State networks and their libraries. OCLC has addressed the latter problem by changing its governance structure. A newly initiated Users Council enables networks and other direct contractors of OCLC services to participate in policymaking affecting their use of OCLC.[2/]

[1/] Norman D. Stevens, "Modernizing OCLC's Governance," Library Journal 102 (November 1, 1977) 19:2216-19.

[2/] Arthur D. Little, Inc., A New Governance Structure for OCLC: Principles and Recommendations, November 1977, p.11.

2.5: Evaluation

Surveys of librarians participating in the OCLC network and ongoing reviews by project staff were judged very useful to operating the project. Informal feedback from the librarians and the input from the librarian Advisory Committees on cataloging, serials, and technical processing were useful. One change resulting from this input was the change in objectives. The remote access and circulation control system was selected to be deferred because the total amount of funds requested was not granted.

The external Advisory Committee comprised five authorities in library automation and regional networks. They reviewed OCLC's overall plans in general and shared-cataloging plans in particular. The Committee expressed no serious criticism of OCLC's planning. Partly as the result of the Committee's concern about problems that would be generated by implementation, a considerable amount of effort was subsequently expended working toward a solution to these problems--particularly toward solving the problem of startup financing.

2.6: Relationship to Other Projects

Of the 15 HEA II-B Library Research and Demonstration projects in the networking area, seven are related to the OCLC operation. In addition to funds received in 1971, OCLC received funds in 1975 to develop a computer-based interlibrary loan communications subsystem. Other related projects were conducted by the Directors of computerized library networks that provide access to OCLC for their member libraries. Their projects are:

- Cooperative Venture Between the Ohio College Library Center and the Cooperative College Library for On-Line Technical Processing, Hillis Davis, Director;
- Demonstration and Evaluation of the Effects of Incentives on Resource Sharing Using a Computerized Interlibrary Communications System, John Linford, Director;

- Factors Affecting the Adaptation of Academic and Other Libraries to On-Line Networks, Barbara Evans Markuson, Director;
- Analysis of Requirements of On-line Network Catalog Service--Small Academic, Public School and Other Libraries, Barbara Evans Markuson, Director; and
- Collection Development Analysis Using OCLC Archival Tapes, Glyn T. Evans, Director.

All these related projects deal in some way with either the implications of OCLC for participating libraries or the development of services or products based on the OCLC system.

OCLC's products are applicable to and are utilized by other library networking projects. Although, technically, participating libraries access the OCLC on-line data base directly, administratively each library accesses the data base through an intermediary State or multistate network. The four librarians interviewed stated that the objectives of the libraries participating in OCLC are to stabilize costs and to reduce the labor intensiveness of cataloging activities. Two librarians judged that the objectives were being met as well as expected; one librarian said "better than expected," and the fourth librarian could not judge because the library had not yet begun using OCLC. The evaluation of OCLC is an informal one. Evidence given for achieving the objectives included a decrease in processing time and a demonstrated savings in personnel costs at several libraries.

The relationship between OCLC and the State Library Agency is considered strong. The Ohio State Librarian felt that the OCLC project was quite unique and that only a few projects have been conducted in this area. Other people may have had similar ideas but OCLC was the only one that successfully implemented them on a nationwide scale.

If Federal funding (e.g., HEA II-B and/or LSCA) were to be stopped it is very unlikely that the State Library Agency would be able to provide substantial support to OCLC from State funds. The reason is that the Agency has no authority to allocate State funds for this purpose. Most State Library Agencies would have the same difficulty. A State Library Agency has little discretion in the use of State funds. Most agencies receive only operational funds or State funds that are locked into formulas. Funds are committed, and usually there are no funds for research and demonstration. According to the State Librarian, the genius of Federal funding is that it is not locked into formula and the Ohio State Library Agency has allocated both LSCA I and LSCA III funds to OCLC over the years.

Many Ohio libraries receive services from OCLC. The State Librarian would like to increase Ohio's involvement in OCLC. He feels that some Ohio libraries that do not currently see the need to join OCLC, need help in making a better decision--they need to be guided into OCLC. The State Librarian feels that OCLC has been very important to the development of library services in Ohio and that OCLC is fundamental not only to Ohio but to the nation. It has affected the cataloging and interlibrary loan practices of all types of libraries.

2.7: Dissemination

The project final report contains a list of 28 reports, articles, and documents prepared and in some cases published by OCLC staff and Director from 1970 to 1972. The list includes instruction manuals for card production, descriptions of the serials and technical processing subsystems, and computer program documentation. The proposal for the project states that the results of the project would be published in several papers and in sufficient technical detail to 1) enable the reader to determine if the system or a segment solved his problem, and 2) determine if it could be transferred. Indications are that the intention to disseminate the results of the project were certainly implemented, as may be illustrated by the list mentioned above. Indeed, a review of the OCLC Annual Reports from 1967 to 1977 shows that throughout that period, the publication level has been high. Other dissemination activity during 1971-1972 included presentation of papers at conferences and distribution of a newsletter to members. The Associate Director of OCLC judged the dissemination activities conducted by the Project Director and staff to be more useful than that conducted by the U.S. Office of Education.

Although the publication level appears high, many current members feel they lack the documentation they need to use the OCLC system, (discussed further in Section 2.4).

2.8: Results/Key Findings

The Associate Director of OCLC judged that the project met its objectives better than expected. He stated that the project, as described in the initial proposal, was much larger than anticipated, and its accomplishments are a monumental achievement.

Unquestionably, OCLC has met its goal: to implement and operate an on-line, computerized regional library system that makes available to faculty and students in individual colleges and universities the library resources throughout a region while at the same time decelerating the rate of rise of per-student library costs. At the end of the grant period in December 1972:

- An on-line union catalog and shared cataloging system was operational.
- The on-line catalog contained over a half million catalog records and over 800,000 location listings in the on-line union catalog.
- Member libraries had demonstrated that the system could slow the rate of rise of per-student costs and could effect net savings for libraries.

In addition, five regions outside Ohio had registered agreements with OCLC to obtain service.

The Associate Director of OCLC identified four factors that contributed to the success of OCLC. First, OCLC addressed a particular need perceived by librarians in Ohio as a real need. Second, someone recognized that the system would require a considerable amount of flexibility to respond to local needs and circumstances if the system were to succeed. Thus, the resulting system had many options for formatting printed catalog cards and for data entry. Many who were at first skeptical of OCLC found the system was compatible with existing operations. This flexibility was costly, but, in the long run, it was important because of the cooperative nature of OCLC. It also distinguishes OCLC from computerized operations as other institutions, such as Stanford University and the University of Chicago. The operations at these institutions were designed initially to meet their particular needs, but are now being adopted or considered for adaptation to a networking mode. A third factor contributing to its success is that it worked. It saved money and it provided a new service--an on-line union catalog. Fourth, OCLC coincided with the function of the Machine-Readable Cataloging (MARC) project which enabled the Library of Congress to provide catalog records in machine-readable format. Thus, OCLC was able to make use of a nationally acceptable format as a basic standard.

Three persons knowledgeable in the area of networking were asked to assess the uniqueness of the OCLC project. They agreed that only a few projects have been conducted in this area. The other examples are the BALLOTS system at Stanford University, and the University of Chicago system. Some aspects of these other systems such as serials check-in, acquisitions, and subject retrieval are more advanced than OCLC. However, no other system has had the nationwide impact OCLC has had in numbers of libraries using the service.

One respondent stated that everyone regards OCLC as superior. Yet, because there is very heavy reliance on OCLC, the system has been limited in its ability to bring up new modules. Another respondent felt that, in addition to the technological accomplishments, a major accomplishment has been illustrated through the linkage of libraries and the potential for even greater interaction exists.

2.9: Impact and Replication of the Project

OCLC has brought twentieth-century technology to the forefront in libraries according to the Associate Director and Director. The OCLC system has reduced the unit cost of cataloging. By providing on-line union catalog information, it has reduced the cost of interlibrary loan. In addition, libraries use the OCLC system for pre-order searching. They also use public service terminals to verify and compile bibliographies and to check for currently received materials.

Four Ohio member librarians spoke positively about the impact of OCLC on users of their services. The Assistant Librarian for Technical Services at an Ohio university described the impact as "overwhelming." Librarians were skeptical in the beginning and now are enthusiastic. The Head Librarian at an Ohio college described the impact as "substantial." All library staff have had to learn to use the terminal. The Library Director of an Ohio public library about to begin using OCLC had high expectations for the future impact of the system on the library. She felt that eventually patrons would benefit from better cataloging and filing practices. OCLC would free the staff from time-consuming, boring routines, and enable the professional staff to do other things such as outreach activities.

The Director of a multistate network using OCLC felt the impact of OCLC upon libraries in his network to be "profound." Cataloging standards are being upgraded. OCLC has brought together the people in cataloging operations and has built a corps of common concern. Complaints that did not exist before are now surfacing. OCLC has involved librarians in MARC and in national standards and generally upgraded the professional aspects of the cataloging.

One objective stated in the project proposal was to serve as a mode in a future national network. Transferability of OCLC's development was to be accomplished by one of two methods. First, another region could replicate OCLC by acquiring and activating the equipment, programs, and bibliographic data in the OCLC system without needing to duplicate analogous development. Second, satellite regions could operate with partial dependence on the OCLC mode. Replication was considered by several other networks but was found to be too expensive in terms of hardware and staff, even if the OCLC data base and software were used as a starting point. The Associate Director estimated that $8.8 million would be needed to replicate the system--$5 million for equipment, $1.5 million for personnel, and $1.3 million for other miscellaneous costs. On the other hand, transferability of OCLC's developments has been achieved successfully by the establishment of satellite library networks.

3: IMPACT OF THE HEA II-B LIBRARY RESEARCH AND DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM ON THIS PROJECT

This section summarizes the comments of key OCLC staff members and Librarians using OCLC about the role that the HEA II-B Library Research and Demonstration Program and its requirements have played in the project. It also presents their views on policy changes and future directions for the program.

3.1: Grant History

OCLC received HEA II-B Library Research and Demonstration Program funds for the 18-month period from September 1, 1969 to February 28, 1971 to develop the first subsystem, a computerized on-line, shared catalog system that would serve as a base for the next five subsystems. OCLC requested $215,740 for a second 18-month period, July 1, 1971 to December 31, 1972, to add the additional subsystems to the cataloging system: serials control, acquisition and circulation control. Because they received only $125,000, OCLC polled its members and was advised to defer the development of the circulation system. It is this second 18-month project ending December 31, 1973 that is the basis for this case study profile. In addition, OCLC received a complementary award of $75,000 from the Council on Library Resources to support development of the computerized regional library system. OCLC also received rent free office space estimated at a value of $10,000 from the Ohio State University.

During 1972 and 1973, OCLC received $580,000 from the State of Ohio. These funds were to subsidize OCLC's activities until the Ohio member institutions could make anticipated budgeting adjustments to pay increased member dues. The subsidy gave members a two-year period to take advantage of normal attrition of personnel to transfer salary payments to OCLC. OCLC's Board of Trustees anticipated that OCLC would be self-supporting at the end of this two-year period.

In addition, OCLC received LSCA III grants ranging from $10,000 to $56,000 in 1968, 1969, 1974, 1975, and 1977. In 1975, OCLC used $550,000 of LSCA I funds for the conversion to machine-readable form of retrospective cataloging at seven major Ohio public libraries. OCLC has also received subsequent research and demonstration grants from the Council of Library Resources.

In 1977 two proposals were submitted to USOE under the HEA II-B Library Research and Demonstration Program but funding was not received. The apparent reason for rejection was the lack of Program funds.

3.2: Monitoring and Technical Assistance

The point of contact at the Federal level was with program officers in Washington, D.C. The Project Director felt the quarterly written reports required by USOE were useful. However, a major criticism was that USOE gave no feedback on the quarterly or final reports. In addition, the Project Director felt that there was no one at USOE with the experience or expertise to be able to judge the project or to offer technical assistance. Generally, any reaction from them was not useful. The quality of assistance provided by the external Advisory Committee and the consultant specialists in library automation and regional networks was very good.

3.3: Perceptions of Present Policy and Recommendations for Future Changes

The Associate Director felt that the current funding level of the HEA II-B Library Research and Demonstration Program should be increased from $1 million to $5 million a year. Given the current level of funding, he stated the program should fund both:

- a few large grants and several smaller grants;
- the traditional user and outreach types of activities; and
- research (40%) and demonstration (60%) projects.

He also favored multi-year funding for projects. He explained that a project which has a one-year funding base spends one-quarter of that time getting started. Three-quarters of a year is not enough time for most projects. The result is that we get only one-half the conclusions, or else projects are unnaturally designed to fit the time frame. This result is true especially of demonstration projects. Furthermore, the recipient has not had enough time to evaluate if more funds should be sought for the project. A longer time frame will also assist USOE to evaluate whether the project is achieving results and whether continuing funds should be granted.

The Associate Director felt that the Program at the Federal level could be improved by providing a longer period of time, at least three months, for potential applicants to respond to the grant announcement. He also felt that results of projects funded should be more widely disseminated. In his opinion the strength of the method used to select the grant applications for funding is panel review. Its weakness is reliance on subjective evaluation. He stated he had strong indications that OCLC was blocked from receiving grants because of panel members' biases. One way to modify the method is to use a referee method.

Regarding the Advisory Committee, the Associate Director favored its reinstatement. He explained that a broad-based Advisory Committee could help the Program Officers formulate better basic guidelines. These guidelines might change from year to year in terms of priorities that need to be emphasized. The Committee could also assist the Officers in technical areas such as technology in which they may lack expertise. Another advantage of an Advisory Committee is it might be a means of presenting positions opposing other governmental-sponsored guidelines, thus serving to depoliticize the direction of guidelines for the Program.

The Associate Director favored the involvement of State Library Agencies in the Program. Agencies should receive an information copy of HEA II-B Research and Demonstration grant applications submitted by organizations in that State. He was against the participation of the Agencies in the review and selection of grant applications to be funded nationally or in that State. Regarding the latter point, there might be a conflict of interest. Local needs may suffer at the expense of State needs. In addition, this step would perpetuate a hierarchy and introduce a "big brother" role for the State Library Agencies. Moreover such a step would depend on the general quality of a State's library service programs.

3.4: Future Directions of the HEA II-B Program

OCLC is a self-supporting, functioning system, and operations are being paid by use charges for products and services. However, grant assistance is needed in developing new programs and in doing research. OCLC will seek funds from the foundations and from the HEA II-B Library Research and Demonstration Program.

The Associate Director of OCLC stated that networking is still in its infancy. Some networks are State-defined; others are multi-State. Total reliance on the State as a main switching center is not the answer. He felt that Federal involvement and money is needed if networking is to progress. OCLC on its own cannot create the network everyone envisions. All information resources need to be brought together in both the private and public sector to bring about a national network. Library networking is such a large undertaking in terms of use and effort that if it is to achieve its potential success, it needs the strength of the Federal government behind it. It needs the resources and commitment of the Federal dollar and of the national libraries. Lacking these elements, networking will develop, but more slowly and erratically.

The Associate Director expressed the following views on the role of the Federal Government. The Federal Government needs to play a significant role in networking; however, the worst possible thing would be for the national network to be under the control of a Federal agency. It would become a political football. The Library of Congress must play a key role and appropriately can take a leadership role to coordinate the component groups involved in networking, but it should not necessarily operate the network. The thrust of the NCLIS national program is towards a centralized government operation, but the Associate Director feels that hierarchies are archaic. The new technology offers the opportunity of alternatives such as distributed network. If a user has an information need, it is an information exchange phenomenon. There may be multiple ways of satisfying that need--a hierarchical route is not always the best way to obtain information.

The Associate Director felt that an appropriate role for the Federal Government is in the area of telecommunications. Legislation needs to be developed to enable library materials to be exchanged at a preferential rate. Library networking needs to develop a satellite communication system with ground support to reduce communication costs. Most on-line interactive systems are tied to Bell and communication cost are one of the most expensive components of networking. Another area to be explored is the use of the GSA telepak.

The Director of OCLC felt that the objectives of the Federal Government should be to grant money for the development but not the operation of networks. Furthermore, he favored Federal support in networking because it would impact library services to users rather than in demonstration projects for special target groups because the latter are temporary palliatives and have no long-lasting benefits. In addition, he felt that OLLR should be in the Library of Congress, but that the Library should be reorganized more along the line of the National Institutes of Health.

3.5: Evaluation and Conclusions

Two implications of this case study for the HEA II-B Research and Demonstration Program and future directions for the Federal Government in this area concern funding patterns and the future of networking. OCLC has received funding from several sources. In the beginning, OCLC used the HEA II-B Research and Demonstration funds as seed money and indications are that these early funds were critical to OCLC's development. At the end of the grant period, results of the on-line union catalog and catalog system were visible and successful enough to influence the Ohio State Legislature to provide OCLC with over one-half million dollars for a two-year period from the Ohio State Legislature. In addition, OCLC received LSCA I and LSCA III funds. The State Library Agency judged OCLC as vital to improving library services and therefore used the only discretionary money available to the Agency--LSCA--to support OCLC development. OCLC also received developmental funds from the Council for Library Resources.

Furthermore, although both academic and public libraries received funds from the Ohio Legislature and LSCA III to offset the cost of purchasing terminals and for startup costs, the libraries in OCLC now include operating costs in their own budgets. This project illustrates one model of the use of Federal, State, and local funds. The challenge is to reach the stage of local support. This is not necessarily the goal of all Federal programs but certainly must be the goal in those cases where money received is used as seed money.

The OCLC Director stated that OCLC is the national network. Others may disagree but OCLC has certainly set the pace. Interview data indicate areas for Federal involvement in networking in the future. Whatever role the Federal Government selects, a major implication is the importance of involving the network users in the decisionmaking. A vital ingredient in library networking is its cooperative aspect.

HEA II-B

LIBRARY RESEARCH AND DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM CASE STUDY

Project Title: Demonstration and Evaluation of the Effects of Incentives on Resource Sharing Using a Computerized Interlibrary Communications System

Project Director: John Lindford

Research Analyst: Libby Trudell

Sponsoring Agency: New England Library Information Network
New England Board of Higher Education

Period of Performance: 1976-1977

Funding Amount: 1976 - $80,000

Location: New England Board of Higher Education,
Wellesley, Massachusetts

1: INTRODUCTION

The New England Library Information Network (NELINET), a forerunner among multi-state networks, has experienced some problems in the sharing of library resources among its neighbors, particularly in the area of interlibrary loan. Large libraries often feel that they lend significantly more than they borrow. What incentive is there for a truly large library to belong to a lending network--at least a State or multi-State one in which they have the most resources to share? Within such a network they may be virtually self-sufficient and have little need of support from smaller libraries. Some institutions, such as Harvard, now charge borrowing libraries lending fees as well as search fees. A more extreme example, Dartmouth, chooses not to belong to the University and College Consortium in New Hampshire and therefore, not to lend materials. Also, the Boston Public Library is reluctant to lend materials. Small libraries often with valuable resources may be overlooked because borrowers automatically turn to the largest libraries with their requests. An increasingly significant problem for libraries with holdings on the Ohio College Library Center (OCLC) data base is a marked increase in interlibrary loan requests, especially when they promptly enter their new holdings. Often the processing of requests seems a random, inefficient or illogical process. These problems often defeat the spirit and intent of cooperatives and networking.

In 1976 NELINET undertook a project, titled Demonstration and Evaluation of the Effects of Incentives on Resource Sharing Using a Computerized Interlibrary Communications System (Computerized Interlibrary Project), with funds provided by an HEA II-B Library Research and Demonstration Program Grant in the amount of $75,953. The New England Board of Higher Education (NEBHE), NELINET's sponsoring agency, provided an additional $7,000. The Project Director is John Lindford; the Research Analyst is Libby Trudell. The first year of the Computerized Interlibrary Project was so successful that NELINET planned on providing its own funds for the second year of the project, had USOE not funded it. However, a second HEA II-B proposal was awarded to continue the work in the amount of $97,000. A third year proposal has recently been submitted, and funding is expected.

This report summarizes the findings of a site visit to observe the NELINET Computerized Interlibrary Project, describing the project in detail in section 2, and discussing the perceptions of key project staff about the HEA II-B Library Research and Demonstration Program in section 3.

2: HISTORY OF THE PROJECT

In order to better understand the nature of the Computerized Interlibrary Project, which is an integral part of the NELINET project as a whole, this section will describe its background, then present a discussion of the Computerized Interlibrary Project.

2.1: Background

New England has two formal bodies which are actively involved in the improvement and promotion of libraries and serve the region's six States: Massachusetts, Connecticut, Rhode Island, New Hampshire, Vermont, and Maine. The first body, the New England Library Board (NELB) is an acquired name of the Governing Board of the New England Interstate Library District. It was established in 1967 by an interstate library compact among the six States. The compact laws of these States permit the establishment of regional and subregional library districts with a governing board comprised of representatives of participating libraries. In 1972 the District adopted new bylaws which designated the District as NELB and defined its membership. The purpose of NELB is to pursue better library services through the establishment of a coordinated multi-state library program, and is oriented toward the concept of State library systems, dealing directly with the public libraries.

The second body, the New England Board of Higher Education (NEBHE) is headquartered outside Boston, and is the sponsoring institution for NELINET. It is authorized by the New England Higher Education Compact, also a formal interstate agreement among six States. NEBHE was established to develop, direct, and promote activities which increase educational activities. It was to be a catalytic agency crossing New England State boundaries in the interests of higher education. At present it fosters cooperation and mutual interests among over 260 public and private institutions of higher learning. NEBHE's operational funding is by the six State governments through legislative appropriations based on population. Each State has board members, representing diverse groups within the State, appointed by its governor and legislature. Among the services NEBHE provides are 1) facilities and staff capable of continuous research and evaluation; 2) information collection and dissemination; 3) acting as an administrative and fiscal agent for higher educational contracts and agreements; 4) consulting services; and 5) serving as a vehicle for regional implementation of Federally and privately funded programs.

Among the several ongoing programs that NEBHE maintains is NELINET. Cooperation between NEBHE and New England libraries began in the mid-1960's when the six land grant university libraries combined forces to apply for Federal funds through NEBHE. NELINET, in unnamed embryonic form, began in 1965-66 with a grant to NEBHE from the Council of Library Resources (CLR) for the development of an automated card cataloging system. NELINET was so named in 1968. Since then, other grants were forthcoming from CLR and USOE for the development of an on-line network. In 1972 NELINET contracted with OCLC.

NELINET facilitates resource and service sharing by operating a New England network capable of serving as a component in an evolving national bibliographic and information network, cooperating with consortia, agencies, and institutions in the development of services and resources to which a computer network might contribute. Each NELINET member has full voting rights in the Membership Council.

There are several areas in which NELINET plans to conduct research and development to improve or introduce programs, but the aforementioned problem of equalization of lending among network libraries represented such a significant impediment to future networking and cooperative growth in the region that in January 1976, the

NELINET Executive Committee mandated the development of the Interlibrary Communication System, with the requirement that automated interlibrary loan be the first subsystem that NELINET was to develop. NELINET contributed the computer hardware and project staff for this "in-house" development effort. A Committee on Interlibrary Communication (CILC) was formed to advise the NELINET staff on the design and evaluation of such a system. CILC members are selected from each of the six States and serve voluntarily without salary. CILC will not be disbanded when the automated interlibrary loan system is implemented; rather it will remain in the capacity of an advisory committee assisting in the development of other ways to improve interlibrary cooperation. Several CILC members already are "looking ahead" to changing and improving modes of delivery among member libraries.

2.2: Methodology

Work on the preliminary research began in September 1976, and this constituted the first year's activity. A literature search on computerized interlibrary loan was conducted by a NELINET research analyst. In November and December 1976, in order to obtain information about then current interlibrary loan traffic patterns in New England, an Interlibrary Loan Base-Line Statistical Survey of selected New England libraries, members and non-members, was conducted. Response was adequate, although it had been hoped that more nonmember libraries would respond. Further exploration of this issue revealed that nonmember libraries often felt they were too small to participate in a NELINET survey.

This Interlibrary Loan Base-Line Statistical Survey was designed to provide evidence to substantiate and/or clarify certain widely held interlibrary loan assumptions including:

- Do large libraries tend to lend more than they borrow while small libraries borrow more than they lend?
- Is most interlibrary loan activity between academic libraries? Do public libraries borrow heavily from academic libraries?
- Is the OCLC Union Catalog a useful interlibrary loan location tool? Are libraries already using it?

- Does most interlibrary loan activity in New England take place between institutions in the same States or across State lines?
- Do libraries observe informal restrictions on borrowing items in print?

These questions were analyzed, conclusions were drawn, and the following questions were analyzed during the final quarter of the project year:

- Does status as a net borrower or net lender have an effect on a library's turnaround time?
- Does turnaround time depend on the type of library loaning the item, or on the distance that an item must go?
- Is there a correlation between fill rate and size or type of library? Does any type of library tend to fill a higher percentage of requests?

In a second segment of the project, CILC and the Project Director defined the Interlibrary Loan Service Goals and Objectives. This was completed in January of 1977; however, it remains a working document and has not yet been made formal policy. Objectives recommended in this document include:

- Responsiveness--Improve speed and efficienty.
- Load leveling--Equalize the load of interlibrary loan and encourage reciprocity.
- Regional context--The system should encourage and facilitate borrowing within New England in the interests of speed, lower costs, and full utilization of regional resources, while being fully compatible with the developing system.
- Multi-level access--All libraries in New England should have on-line or individual access to the services of the interlibrary loan system and the system should serve all types of libraries.

One public library member of CILC has been especially vocal and adamant about the need for policy governing multi-level access. It was observed that because the present interlibrary loan request form requires the patron's name and borrowing status, that discrimination exists; in other words, a judgmental value is often made on the part of the lending library as to whether or not the requesting patron's status or need is great enough. Not only should "serious" research requests be honored, but hobbyist and other more casual requests, which are so common to most public libraries, should receive equal consideration.

A union catalog survey of the New England States was also sponsored and conducted by CILC. Although the OCLC data base serves as a primary location tool, the goal of the interlibrary loan system is to make use of as many additional authoritative sources of interlibrary loan information as possible. Response to letters sent to State Library Agencies and directors of a number of library cooperative groups showed that there are only five significant union catalogs in New England. The sponsors of the existing catalogs were sent brief questionnaires concerning their potential as resources for interlibrary loan.

In a third segment of the study, CILC created a mathematical model of an interlibrary loan system which provides incentive for load-leveling. In the model, market values were assigned to each library to identify heavy lenders and encourage requests to other libraries when possible. The effectiveness of a load-leveling technique has been evaluated, determined to be appropriate and workable, and will be incorporated in the proposed system.

As the system design now stands, all NELINET members are to be able to communicate directly with each other via terminals, sending and receiving interlibrary loan requests and status reports. On-line information about interlibrary loan policy, potential lenders and automatic "best lender" selection, and average turnaround time based on individual borrowing preference profiles have been added to the original data to be provided to the user of the system. The requests are automatically routed to the best service according to interlibrary loan profile the system produces.

At this time software development is in the planning stage. CILC is aiding the NELINET staff in choosing and defining the data elements to be included in the screen formats and the functional requirements and transaction sequence for the interlibrary loan system. This descriptive documentation began in April 1977.

2.3: Staffing

NELINET personnel were used to staff the project. The previous NELINET Executive Director initially served as Principal Investigator, and was largely responsible for developing the concept for the project along with the NELINET Director of Systems, who directed the project. The project also has a programmer, and a research analyst/technical writer/editor whose tasks were originally intended to be staffed with two positions; but in fact, one person performed both duties. A more equalized distribution of tasks is anticipated this year. The project was also assigned a secretary.

Staffing has been a serious problem. During the first year of the project, the project's Principal Investigator left the project.[1] In the interim, the CILC Chairperson and Vice Executive Director of NELINET assumed control of NELINET. Later the Project Director also left the project. When NELINET hired a new Executive Director (in the Summer of 1977), he was assigned the responsibility for directing the project and acted as its Principal Investigator.

2.4: Problems

No major problems other than staff turnover have been encountered by the project, although the issue of how the project's services will be made available to nonmember libraries is pressing. There is an acute realization that academic membership has "peaked" in this six-State region network, and that public libraries have remained largely untapped. As the CILC Chairperson said, "There is a psychological 'mindset' in this State about development and funding, and with that attitude sights (ambitions) tend to be lowered." This similar attitude toward NELINET costs, usefulness, etc. were voiced in one member State's Library Agency. Massachusetts surprised its CILC member by a notable lack of enthusiasm to the project promotion at a State meeting. Speculation by some of the respondents for the cause of this is that the Massachusetts Bureau of Library Extension has been uncooperative with NELINET. This situation might explain why one person interviewed felt it best to keep HEA II-B Library Research and

---

[1] He was interviewed as part of this case study, however.

Demonstration funding separate from other funding and to continue to channel funds directly to the project and not through State Library Agencies.

2.5: Advisory Council

The Sub-Committee of Interlibrary Communication and Cooperation was formed in 1975 and became CILC in September 1976. Its members are appointed by the NELINET Executive Committee and receive no salary. The Committee is comprised of seven librarians and one chairperson. At present five librarians and its Chairperson are academic; one is public; and one is from a State Library Agency. One member would like to see increased representation on the Committee for public libraries and has actively attempted to recruit such an individual throughout New England. CILC generally meets informally on a monthly basis and formally every three months to receive project reports. As an indication of the scope of the matters considered by CILC, at their September meeting NELINET's position at the White House Conference was discussed, and CILC members were formally charged by NELINET to:

- Identify existing interlibrary communication procedures which could be done more efficiently using the ILCS (Interlibrary Communication System);
- Identify other uses to which the ILCS might be put;
- Draft a policy on use of the system which will exploit the full potential of ILCS; and
- Report its progress to the Executive Committee at each regular meeting.

There has been only one change in CILC membership since its inception. This fact is viewed as a positive indication of enthusiasm about the project.

2.6: Project Evaluation

The project staff and CILC are the key evaluating and monitoring bodies and engage in these activities at regular meetings and in an ongoing fashion. An end-of-project review is being written in September and October by project staff. Also a subcommittee of CILC is evaluating the project, particularly in terms of the Service Goals each member had been specifically assigned to develop and work.

2.7: Dissemination

CILC members and NELINET project staff have actively promoted the project with selected audiences such as meetings conducted by State Library Agencies. Within their respective States, CILC members speak at library meetings and gatherings and attempt to "proselytize." Most of the written dissemination about the project is starting now, at the end of the project year. Journal articles are being prepared. The Research Analyst is preparing two and will present one at a meeting in October. Various CILC members are preparing journal articles and conference papers. News releases to State Library Agency news organizations, newspapers, etc. were made. The Final Report will be disseminated through ERIC once it has been accepted by USOE.

2.8: Relationships With Other Projects

OCLC is also conducting an interlibrary loan project, and NELINET requested that there be a liaison between them. The liaison is at two levels, philosophical and administrative, and technical links are maintained with eventual linkage proposed and NELINET to be used on a regional level. In the opinions of CILC members interviewed, the OCLC project, initiated earlier, is moving very slowly, and the relationship is somewhat one-sided with CILC being more interested in cooperation. A couple of meetings have been attended in Ohio, but CILC feels the initiative is all theirs.

A librarian in a major academic library felt that CILC was disappointed in the relationship with OCLC, but that NELINET itself had greater interaction with OCLC. NELINET had requested that for its interlibrary loan research, OCLC select some test sites from New England. They were initially turned down by OCLC. Later, apparently after inquiry from USOE, OCLC did change its plans, but testing has now been postponed from September 1977 to April 1978. The project staff regards the liaison in favorable terms. Attending Ohio meetings and making onsite visits are rated as very useful. The Research Analyst felt that written communication with OCLC is not adequate.

2.9: Findings

A final report for the first year of the project was not available at the time of the site visit; earlier quarterly reports describe the progress and findings of the project. During the first and second quarters a literature search was conducted, and the remaining components planned and implemented. In the third and fourth quarters the Union Catalog Study and the Interlibrary Loan Base-Line Survey were completed and analyzed. Early formulation of the system design began as soon as the first data were available, and circulation of preliminary drafts enabled potential users to comment on the design. These comments are being incorporated into the analysis and design activities.

2.10: Impact/Replication

Because final results were not yet completed at the time of the site visit, and the system not yet implemented, it was the opinion of respondents that it was too early to assess the full impact of the Computerized Interlibrary Project. However, NELINET is very interested in the outcomes, and it is likely that the model will be very well received. Before the model is tested, however, the extent of its impact cannot be estimated.

Interest in the replication of this project is also viewed as premature at this point because the demonstration aspect of the project has not yet started. NELINET may eventually assist in replication or make the service available to others, but no plans have been developed as yet. The members of the Council for Computerized Library Networks (CCLN) representing the heads of most networks in the country do receive copies of all reports. NELINET also maintains a mailing list of approximately 20 people who have inquired about the project.

3: IMPACT OF THE HEA II-B LIBRARY RESEARCH AND DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM ON THIS PROJECT

This section will summarize the perceptions of project staff and NELINET staff about the role that the HEA II-B Library Research and Demonstration Program has played in facilitating the attainment of project objectives.

3.1: Grant History

NELINET submitted a proposal through NEBHE to USOE in January 1976 initially requesting funding for a two-year project. The proposal was not approved, and it was recommended that the proposal be resubmitted as a one-year research project proposal. It was revised and resubmitted in May 1977. This time, USOE approval and funding for $75,953 were received. NEBHE contributed $7,000. The present staff considers the total funding received to be seed money, the former Executive Director did not. The Principal Investigator and NEBHE accountant were involved in budget preparation. Although the project would have been funded by NELINET if Federal funds had not been granted, the actual research would have had to have been more slowly implemented because NELINET is now totally member-supported. The second year of the project, beginning September 1, 1977, is funded with a Title II-B Library Research and Demonstration grant of $94,460 by USOE. A third proposal has been submitted as well, and funding is expected.

3.2: Monitoring and Technical Assistance

With regard to USOE review of the project, after an initial formal review, the USOE Program Officer's reviews have been of a more informal nature, with assistance primarily pertaining to Federal regulations, etc. rather than technical issues. In March 1977, a site visit took place, and the project was reviewed informally in positive terms. USOE contact is with the project staff, and not CILC. The NEBHE Executive Director is less involved in evaluating.

Monitoring activities consist mainly of quarterly reports by the project staff to USOE. The former Principal Investigator considered these reports to be of average utility though the junior staff found them more useful. Also informal oral reports via telephone were made and these too were considered useful, as were the occasional USOE Program Officer visits to the project.

3.3: Perceptions of Policy and Recommendations for Future Changes

The staff of the Computerized Interlibrary Project were favorably inclined toward the current HEA II-B Library Research and Demonstration

Program and the role it plays in library research. They considered the objectives of the Program to be successful, and funding levels and patterns to be appropriate. However, the Research Analyst felt that demonstration projects are more practical than research projects. Multi-year funding is favored because it was found that the year-by-year funding for this project resulted, in the first year, in an over-emphasis on research and not enough on the focusing of the research toward demonstration.

It was felt that USOE should clarify grant regulations so that it is clear what proposals should emphasize and what their limits are. The staff also felt that the selection of readers for proposals should be more standardized. The time allowed for proposal preparation was felt to be too short.

In contrast to the former Executive Director, the present one deemphasizes the value of long-term Federally funded projects in the research and assessment stage, believing that there is a danger of overassessment. One can demonstrate needs informally (by doing preliminary literature searches, etc. on one's own) before applying for Federal funds. He places emphasis on the demonstration phase. Not all CILC members agree.

Most interviewed did not advocate multi-year funding. As the CILC Chairperson said "I'm just a doubter. People need to be checked on or they get too comfortable, lose something." Opinions are divided between whether research, demonstration, or both should be given funding preference.

3.4: Future Directions

The CILC Chairperson felt that the project was about six months behind time because of the staff changes, while a librarian involved in the project said they had hoped to implement the project in one year, but it may take longer. There are still many technical decisions to be settled. Nonetheless, at this stage of development there is overall satisfaction with the project and few complaints.

Overall, project staff and CILC members are so satisfied with the progress of the project that no special recommendations for changes were made. The former Executive Director and a CILC member would like to see more funds, but no one cited lack of funds as a detriment to their project. All interviewed expressed the attitude that, with the final evaluation for the year not yet completed and with the project just entering its demonstration year, it is too early to make judgments. Cautious optimism seems to be the prevalent attitude.

HEA II-B

LIBRARY RESEARCH AND DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM CASE STUDY

Project Title:	Relationship of Social Participation to Use of Media Among Mexican-American Urban Poor (Latino Communications Project)
Project Director:	Margaret S. Monroe
Principal Investigator:	Daniel Duran
Sponsoring Agency:	University of Wisconsin - Madison Library School
Period of Performance:	July 1, 1976 - October 1, 1977
Funding Amount:	$18,702
Location:	University of Wisconsin - Madison Madison, Wisconsin

1: INTRODUCTION

The original intent of the Latino Communications Project was to study the relationship of aspects of Mexican-American participation in voluntary associations to the use by this population of various media for both information gathering and personal satisfaction. This research was intended to provide a knowledge base for the development of library services to this segment of the Latino population. Once underway, the proposed study was shifted from Milwaukee to Chicago permitting the use of a comparative research design including Cuban and Puerto Rican groups, thereby allowing a greater degree of generalization to the Latino Community.

The project was conducted by Dr. Margaret Monroe, Professor of Library Sciences, University of Wisconsin-Madison and Daniel Duran, a Research Assistant. It was funded for $18,702 by the HEA II-B Library Research and Demonstration Program, and was completed in the thirteen months, ending October 1, 1977. The sponsoring agency for the project was the University of Wisconsin-Madison. The Latino Communications Project employed two Chicago-based subcontractors, Operations Market Advertising Research of Chicago, a Latino-oriented firm, and National Opinion Research Corporation which consulted on design aspects.

The Latino Communications Project resulted in a complete set of baseline data about the attitudes of Latino groups toward the traditional mass media and information resources in the Chicago area. The potential uses of these data extend to many different aspects of information and communications services, and also provide a valuable contribution to the analysis of Latino community needs. The final report had not been completed at the time of this site visit, however.

This report summarizes the Latino Communications Project's activities and findings and the perceptions of key project staff concerning the role that the HEA II-B Library Research and Demonstration Program played in the conduct of this study.

2: HISTORY OF THE PROJECT

This section summarizes the objectives, methodology and findings, and impact of the Latino Communications Project.

2.1: Objectives

The objectives of the Latino Communications Project were to:

- Examine the use of communication media by a sample of Mexican-American adults residing in an urban poverty area;
- Relate aspects of participation in formal voluntary associations to the use of electronic and print media for both information gathering and personal satisfaction;
- Identify the predictive strength of socio-structural and social psychological variables that define nonuse of information resources and formal voluntary associations; and
- Determine the relationship between types and levels of participation in formal voluntary associations to different use of the mass media and information resources.

These objectives were unaffected by the shift in target populations from Milwaukee to Chicago.

2.2: Methodology

The study focused on a group of hypotheses that related Mexican-American participation in formal voluntary associations to levels of information use of the electronic and print media. The major method of investigation was a survey design utilizing a combination of personal and telephone interviews. Three indices were to be utilized to measure the variables of participation in formal voluntary associations, reading activity, and mass media use. The study was undertaken to suggest service models and intervention strategies for such information agencies as the public library to assist them in serving the Mexican-American community.

The selection of Chicago as the final field site made possible the development of a comparative research design that included Cubans and Puerto Ricans in addition to Mexican-Americans as the population sample. The comparative nature of the Chicago-based survey research project allowed for a greater degree of generalization than possible under the original proposal plan. The purposes of the study required the selection of a research site with substantial numbers of Spanish-speaking adults living in an environment with informal avenues of information dissemination as well as the traditional print and electronic media. As stated earlier, a major objective of the survey research project was to address the problem of how the public library can more effectively meet the information needs of the Spanish-speaking community. This objective required an examination of the role of the public library as an information agency in the formal mass media and informal communication environment of the Latino community.

During the first quarter of the project, Chicago was selected as the survey research site, and a census of Latino organizations in Chicago was completed. Discussions were held with representative Latino organizations, and working relationships with Chicago-based Latino researchers were developed. The search for a research organization capable of administering the approximately 400 personal interviews of Chicago's Spanish-speaking population was successfully completed. This was conducted by Operations Market Advertising Research (OMAR) of Chicago. National Opinion Research Corporation of Chicago consulted on the design of the instrument and trained the interviewers.

A four-stage sampling process was used. First, census tracts with 400 or more Latino residents were identified. From these, 45 tracts were selected, with 15 tracts selected for each of the three major Latino groups (Mexican-American, Puerto Rican, and Cuban) in Chicago. Households within tracts were sampled proportionately to the representation of Latino households in each tract yielding a sample size of 400. Blocks were than clustered on the basis of geographical location and housing units; next, respondents within units were selected.

Final field interviews were conducted between February and April 1977. The 400 interview schedules were than verified, edited, coded, keypunched, and analyzed. Analysis of data and the Final Report were completed during the last phase of the project.

2.3: Staffing

The staff, other than the subcontractors, consisted of one part-time (17 percent) administrator, one full-time analyst, and part-time consultants, programmers, and clerical workers.

2.4: Problems

The Project Director reported that lack of funds was a serious problem. Originally, the cost of the project was underestimated. One $700 supplement to the budget was made in May 1977. Key staff believe that to replicate a study of such depth would cost approximately $60,000. The project was completed with an extra grant from University of Wisconsin Graduate Library School, support from the Minorities Scholarship Fund during different times, and private funds. Also, OMAR personnel contributed a great amount of time to the project.

Other problems dealt with the difficulty in finding bilingual interviewers. A trained corps of Spanish-speaking interviewers, especially from the grassroot level was not available. Many Latino organizations were suspicious of "yet another study" being done on them. Planning took this into account, and project staff explained the projects to the communities well in advance of the study. They also made sure that the results would be relayed to the communities. Little or no political conflict occurred because all Latino community groups were consulted to facilitate cooperation.

2.5: Project Evaluation

No formal evaluations of this project had been conducted at the time of the site visit, but the USOE Project Officer had informally reviewed much of the project work, assisted in pointing out earlier studies, and made revisions to the project schedules.

2.6: Relationship to Other Studies

The applicability of the project to all kinds of agencies (libraries, social service, government, etc.) cannot be overemphasized. There are other researchers in Chicago and the Midwest who have linked up with the Latino Communications Project in the hope of combining their research interests with those of the Latino Communications Project. A number of bilingual education researchers are currently attempting to develop a working relationship with Latino Communications Project. One of the primary objectives of the Latino Communications Project was to bring together the data and data gatherers who share a commonality of interests. According to the Research Assistant, the research concerns of the Latino Communications Project have put the whole question of this form of library research at the center of a diverse group of researchers. He further concludes that the Latino Communications Project acts as a Latino research catalyst, bringing together the concerns and findings of researchers concerned with problems affecting the Latino population. It is natural, he says, that a library research project would bring together the raw data and findings of other research, but it is less usual to see the types of multiplier effect that this project is having on related ongoing research studies.

2.7: Dissemination

Some excerpts from the final report have been released, but until the data are evaluated and the Final Report written, there will be little dissemination of findings.

2.8: Results/Key Findings

This was the first time that a complete data bank (including reading ability and interests, political participation and interests, attitudes to various aspects of the mass media, formal and informal voluntary associations) had ever been completed for a Spanish-speaking community. Factors such as cultural persistence, language-loyalty differences, and media attitudes were compared among the three Spanish-speaking groups. The public library was one of 27 institutions not described negatively by the respondents. However, one third of the sample did not know what a public library was. The survey showed that while personal contacts with formal institutions varied, the public library was rarely mentioned as one of those institutions contacted frequently. This was especially true of the Mexican-American population, which is the oldest Spanish-speaking group in Chicago.

2.9: Impact/Replication

The applications of the Latino Communications Project data base go far beyond the public library. Presently all kinds of Latino and non-Latino groups are requesting the data to gather further knowledge about Latino attitudes. One of the major accomplishments of the project may be the development of a Latino data bank combining this research data with the data of other Latino-oriented projects or studies. The Project Director sees this combining together of research projects on the Latino population as particularly important as the research on Latinos will give the library profession a better picture of both the users and non-users.

3: IMPACT OF THE HEA II-B LIBRARY RESEARCH AND DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM ON THIS PROJECT

This section summarizes the perceptions of key project staff as to the role the HEA II-B Library Research and Demonstration Program has played in the completion of the Latino Communication Project.

3.1: Grant History

The project came into being because (1) a search of the literature showed that nothing of this magnitude had ever been attempted for a Spanish-speaking population; (2) the Principal Investigator was specifically interested in research in the area of Spanish-speaking information and referral services and, in fact, was the recipient of a fellowship to pursue such a goal.

The original proposal for the Latino Communications Project was funded by the HEA II-B Library Research and Demonstration Program the first time it was submitted for $18,002. However, this amount was insufficient, and an additional sum of $700 was received from the Program in May 1977. Additional income was required from outside sources, including the donation of extra time by one of the subcontractors and by the Research Assistant. One other grant had been awarded to the Project Director by the Research and Demonstration Component of HEA II-B previous to the Latino Communications Project. Two grant applications for unrelated projects have not been funded.

3.2: Monitoring and Technical Assistance

The Latino Communications Project reported quarterly in writing to USOE, and more frequently by informal oral means. The Project Officer also conducted several site visits. The project staff reported that USOE gave feedback on the written reports and communicated with them about literature and other projects of interest to their own. Staff rated the monitoring as useful and relevant.

3.3: Perceptions of Policy and Recommendations for Changes

As indicated above, this project requested the addition of outside funds and a contract modification to allow successful completion. As might be expected, the project staff recommended increased Program funding, aimed primarily at research. The staff also favored multi-year funding for large-scale projects and more time for preparation of proposals. The Project Director recommended that review panels for grants be more diversified, include research experts as well as librarians, and be more diversified in professional background and representation of demographic and geographic characteristics.

3.4: Future Directions

The researchers felt that followup (replication) is needed in other communities. Also, this study dealt with types of media, but did not concern itself with the quality of media used by Latino communities nor with its ability to meet the users' needs and desires for communication. These are areas important to further research.

Another researcher believed that more analyses of the present data available on Latinos, such as the great bulk of the Latino Communications Project data which is not yet published. Funding is needed to continue this kind of project. He also emphasized the fact that the government (Federal) has generally failed in its analysis of data on Hispanics and Blacks. Presently, only the U.S. Census and Surveys of School enrollments give any kind of portrayal of these groups. This is one-sided because both groups have displayed some strong feelings about participating in both these surveys. Little research has been done on the relationship of Hispanics and the media. He expressed concern over the fact that so many dissertations having possibilities for social impact end up being academic exercises. The Project Director agreed with this point.[1]

---

[1] The funding of doctoral research is not generally considered to fall within the scope of the HEA II-B Library Research and Demonstration Program.

HEA II-B

LIBRARY RESEARCH AND DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM CASE STUDY

Project Title: Minority Program Development for Libraries and Learning Resources

Project Director: Nicholas E. Gaymon

Sponsoring Agency: Florida A&M University

Period of Performance: June 1972 - May 1974

Funding Amount: $121,785

Location: Florida A&M University, Tallahassee, Florida

1: INTRODUCTION

The major purpose of the Minority Program Development for Libraries and Learning Resources Project (Minority Program Development Project) was to give concrete assistance to a systematic program development for libraries and resource centers for minority constituents. The project addressed the need to resolve the problem that while there are several special collections concerning minority materials, there is no national network or cooperative system which provides central access to these collections. This project is specifically concerned with the lack of such a system for the special libraries and collections of Black literature and materials. The Minority Program Development Project was initially funded for one year beginning in June 1972 for $121,785. It was directed by Dr. Nicholas Gaymon of Florida A&M University.

The project resulted in three products: an index to bibliographic holdings in the content area; a design of a national network for Black materials; and the sponsorship of attendance at workshops and conferences. This project helped to bring about an awareness of the urgency of the need for the organization and dissemination of resources for minority groups. Because of legal problems surrounding the award of the grant, little or no dissemination of results has been effected.

This report describes the Minority Program Development Project in some detail. Section 2 discusses the background to the study, the methodology, and the problems, including the impact of the above-referenced litigation, encountered. Section 3 summarizes the perceptions of key project staff as to the impact that the HEA II-B Library Research and Demonstration Program has had on this project.

2: HISTORY OF THE PROJECT

2.1: Objectives

The objective of this project was to develop a concrete basis on which the organized development of programs for minority populations could be based.

2.2: Methodology

The Minority Program Development Project was designed to meet its objective by: coordinating program thrusts with the Library Training Institute for the development of Negro libraries; supporting conference expenses for specialized groups to discuss library needs of minority constituents; establishing groups of consultants and coordinating ad hoc meetings of selected members of this group to address specific issues; serving as a clearinghouse to handle communication and dissemination about activities; supporting special analytical studies as necessary to determine needs, priorities, and plans; and, developing plans and initiating measures to support effective management of ethnic collections and library consortia.

In meeting this objective, several activities were undertaken: compilation of a bibliographic index, design of a national network, and the sponsoring of workshops and conferences. These are described briefly below.

Libraries supplied bibliographic data to compile a data base, and these data were used to develop an index. This data base included a subject index, a full citation listing, and an author/publication index. It was completed by Optimum Bibliographics, Inc. under a contract to the Minority Program Development Libraries and Learning Resources project.

Another component of the project was the design of a national network for the acquisition, organization, processing, and dissemination of materials by and about Blacks. This was produced under a contract to Urban Resource Systems of Huslett, Michigan and was submitted in a report dated January 1974.

A third component of the project was the sponsoring of attendance by individuals to particular workshops and conferences. The workshop programs were not produced under this project, but there was cooperation between possible organizers and the project to discuss aspects which would be interesting to the Black librarians whose attendance at the workshops would be sponsored by the project. Workshops which were conducted included an archives workshop, a government publications workshop, a workshop at Fisk University, and a Black Resources Conference at Alabama State University in Montgomery.

2.3: Staffing

The project was primarily staffed by administrative personnel and much of the actual performance of the work was sub-contracted to other agencies. Staffing was seen by the Project Director as inadequate, as is noted in the following section.

2.4: Problems

The Minority Program Development Project had many problems, such as staffing, which existed from the beginning. The primary problem, however, was a legal question as to the propriety of the grant award.1/ There was some question, at the time of the procurement, about the procedures utilized in awarding this grant. A staff member of the U.S. Office of Education was released from Federal employment as a result of this, and his activities and relationships with the projects are currently the subject of an investigation by the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

These legal questions have had an observable impact on the project, according to staff members and the site visit team. The original objectives and guidelines had been somewhat ambiguous, but there appeared to be a great effort to strictly account for trends in project performance and to achieve the stated objective. However, because of the litigation, the U.S. Department of Justice recommended that the bibliographic index, one of the project's end-products, should not be published.

1/ The affects of this legal dispute were evident during the interviews.

2.5: Evaluation of the Project

Reviews of the project were conducted near its completion in April 1974 by project staff and by the USOE Project Officer. As a result of this review, the project schedule was extended. In reviewing the project, the Project Director felt that the project did a good job of meeting its objectives of getting librarians together and beginning the development of cooperation.

2.6: Relationship to Other Projects

The Project Director was asked about his awareness of any library networking or cooperative projects to which his project's products or results apply. He responded that there was application to traditional all-Black academic formal and informal organizations, but he was not aware of any formal network or library cooperative arrangements. However, all of the traditional Black academic libraries are located in the Southeast, and this proximity may have resulted in relationships he does not know about.

Perhaps the closest relationship at the time of the project was with the Cooperative College Library Center (CCLC), a non-profit, tax-exempt corporation. The membership of the Center included 21 private Black colleges located in a 10-state area of the South. Eighteen of the members were also members of the United Negro College Fund. The CCLC's services including batching and placing of orders (based on selections by member libraries), check-in, cataloging, and book processing. The Minority Program Development for Libraries and Learning Resources sponsored visits to the CCLC by interested individuals. In addition, the CCLC was already providing services which were called for in the national network design phase of this project, namely: acquisition, organization and processing.

2.7: Dissemination

Dissemination was an important activity for this project while operational--it was the meeting with and sharing of ideas with interested librarians, for example, which contributed importantly to project outcomes. Dissemination of final products, however, was restricted because of the litigation mentioned previously.

2.8: Results/Key Findings

In addition to sponsoring the attendance of professionals at several conferences and workshops, this project resulted in two significant products: an index to materials and a design for a national network for materials by and about Blacks.

2.9: Impact/Replication

As discussed above, the impact of this project appears to have been severely limited due to the restrictions on dissemination. The Project Director felt that the project did bring about an awareness of the need to develop minority programs. The Project Director also feels "that the national network for the acquisition, organization, processing, and dissemination of materials by and about Blacks" could be replicated as a network with no assistance from him. He feels that, because the design was never actually used, established may be a better word than replicated.

3: IMPACT OF THE HEA II-B LIBRARY RESEARCH AND DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM ON THIS PROJECT

This section summarizes the perceptions of key project staff about the impact of the HEA II-B Research and Demonstration Program on the Minority Program Development Project.

3.1: Grant History

The proposal for this project had been submitted to the HEA II-B Library Research and Demonstration Program in the year prior to initial funding, but the request exceeded the amount of funds available, so a second submission was made the following year (1972), and it was accepted. The original intent of the project was to obtain "seed" money for a multi-year project, but, after the end of the

HEA II-B Library and Research Demonstration Program grant, no further funding was available. The major reason for this appears to have been the aforementioned problems encountered during the award of the initial grant.

Subsequent to this project, the Project Director has submitted additional grant requests to the HEA II-B Library Research and Demonstration Program, but none has been funded. He also intends to submit projects in the future, but his interests are not in the areas of minority concerns. These proposals would be more reflective of his role as a university library director, although he still sees Black resources as an important area for library research and development.

3.2: Monitoring and Technical Assistance

The Project Director felt that the most beneficial advice from agencies outside the project staff was received from the Federal level. The advisory committee was rated second in helpfulness and the State last. The Project Director reported two or three visits and frequent telephone contact by the USOE Program Officer. He would have liked a Federal representative available in the region. The Program Officer was often not available to this project because of the need to visit other projects supported by the Program. The Program Officer was helpful in explaining Federal requirements to the Project Director, especially concerning the legal problems mentioned earlier. State requirements in contract awarding created unforeseen problems for this project when two major contracts were awarded to outside agencies. This occurred because the sponsoring agency was a State supported institution.

The State Librarian was asked about a Federal role in libraries and information services. He felt that the dissemination of information about projects is "pitiful." Perhaps if dissemination were better, it would ease the pain of the grant amount being so small. He felt that there is a lack of communication between the practitioner and the educator and that this communication should be improved.

3.3: Perceptions of Policy and Recommendations for Future Funding

The Project Director felt that the Advisory Panel for reviewing HEA II-B Research and Demonstration proposals should be reinstated. [This panel was never dissolved.] If it were, he would like to see higher education administration represented because he would like communication established with the persons to whom he is immediately responsible concerning the interests, activities, and projects in which he is to be involved. A feeling seems to exist that the institution's administration is not knowledgeable about the purview and activities of the library. It should be noted that when asked who was involved in setting priorities for this project, the administration of the university was not included.

The State Librarian, when queried about the use of an Advisory Committee at the Federal level had many opinions to offer. He felt that an Advisory Committee would give the Federal Government an idea of what is going on in the field. He also felt that it can contribute to dissemination of information about projects and advances in the field. In addition to others, he would like to see funding recipients represented. He would also like to have State, local, and regional government administrators represented. This State Librarian felt that it is necessary to regularly change the participants on the committee.

Project staff felt comfortable with the HEA II-B Library Research and Demonstration Program and its funding decisions, and they felt that the Program had been successful in meeting its objectives. They would, however, recommend a 500 percent increase in the size of the Program. They prefer funding smaller grants rather than a few large ones. They also would like to see multi-year funding of projects.

It is the Project Director's feeling that larger, "prestige" institutions are more successful in their attempts to receive Program funds. Perhaps this reflects the Project Director's position as the library director for a predominantly Black university of relatively small size.

He feels that the project review panel should be more attentive to the merits of the proposal and reviewers should be selected from other than the larger, prestige institutions in order to make the selection of projects for funding more equitable. This Project Director is knowledgeable about the grant process and sources for funds. Indeed, subsequent to the funded project, other proposals were submitted to HEA II-B Library Resource and Demonstration Program, more proposals are planned in the future, and the Ford Foundation (a private source of funds) has also been approached.

3.4: Future Directions

The Minority Program Development Project's end-products, a bibliography and an information network system design, have been stalled through contractual and legal problems. Although complete, no effort is being made to transform either product into an ongoing working system. No funding, Federal or regional, is currently available, and it seems likely, due to the political problems, that neither project will be implemented. This fate may possibly be attributed to bureaucratic "hang-ups" apparent at USOE in the award of the contract and in the State of Florida in approval of subcontracts. Another factor may be a lack of followup in many quarters to results of promising research which would allow these results to be translated into action programs.

HEA II-B

LIBRARY RESEARCH AND DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM CASE STUDY

Project Title:	The Development of Strategies for Dealing With the Information Needs of Urban Residents
Project Director:	Brenda Dervin
Sponsoring Agency:	School of Communications, University of Washington
Period of Performance:	July 1974 - June 1977
Funding Amount:	1974 - $56,478 1975 - $73,264 1976 - $77,122
Location:	University of Washington, Seattle, Washington

I: INTRODUCTION

The project to Develop Strategies for Dealing With the Information Needs of Urban Residents (Urban Information Needs Project) was designed to study human services delivery in urban areas and determine needs, assess current delivery patterns, and design training programs which would help practitioners improve their delivery of services. Because of their present role as information centers as well as their tendency to be located close to their clientele, libraries seemed to the investigators to be the "logical context" for such a study. The Urban Information Needs Project was funded by the Component HEA II-B Library Research and Demonstration Program for three years starting in 1974. The Project Director was Dr. Brenda Dervin of the School of Communications of the University of Washington. The Assistant Investigator was Dr. Douglas Zweizig of the University's School of Librarianship.

The implementation of training sessions and dissemination of findings and training materials has marked the successful completion of the project. Its end result has been a set of workshops and training modules for use in information delivery systems to facilitate librarian-client interactions.

This report describes the Urban Information Needs Project. Section 2 discusses the methodology and findings of the project; section 3 describes the impact that the HEA II-B Library Research and Demonstration Program has had on project management and direction.

2: HISTORY OF THE PROJECT

This section presents a discussion of the background of the project, its objectives, methodology and findings, as well as its impact.

2.1: Objectives

In designing the study it was felt that libraries were an ideal starting point for such an investigation. The project looked at three phases or stages in the process of serving the information needs of an urban community:

- Phase I concentrated on the potential and actual clients--how they articulate their needs, the kinds of situations they see themselves facing, how they see themselves coping, how they make sense and inform themselves, what they call information, and the utilities they find in information.
- Phase II looked at how information practitioners interpret citizen articulations of information needs, needs situations, coping methods, and information processing approaches.
- Phase III developed training modules for use with information practitioners to facilitate their delivery of services. The modules will be based on the Phase I and II results.

The project was funded for three years, corresponding to the three phases: in Fiscal Year 1974 for $56,478; in Fiscal Year 1975 for $73,264; and in Fiscal Year for $77,122.

The emphasis of the Urban Information Needs Project has been on the how (How are strategies for serving the information needs of clients developed?) rather than on the what (What are the topic contents of information needs potential clients may have?).

The development of the project objectives was based on the Project Director's previous research. In the early 1970's it was possible to say that virtually no studies were available with a primary focus on citizens and their information needs, but by 1976 some half-dozen studies were available. This early work was clearly rooted in the practices of the past in the opinion of the Project Director.

> "The question being asked was a system-design question -- studies focused for the most part on identifying the topical nature of citizen information needs. The basic model implied was relatively simple: first, the universe of information needs in a given community would be described. Next, the information practitioner would collect and organize for retrieval purposes relevant information on these needs, and sufficient efforts would be made at publicity. Finally, citizens would have access to a new service: an information service."

The current project built on this approach, but for the first time, attempted to look at library service in the context of human needs and not simply in terms of topical concerns.

2.2: Methodology

The Urban Information Needs Project methodology varied for each phase depending on the objectives, as described below.

Needs Assessment

A random sample of the Seattle urban resident population, was drawn. Interviews with 500 persons were conducted, using a questionnaire which was carefully constructed to obtain information on:

- problems, worries, and concerns of residents;
- analysis of one of these problems in depth to find out how respondent dealt/would deal with it; and
- analyses with respondents of hypothetical situations so that a common stimulus might be provided for comparisons among respondents.

Data were analyzed with two purposes in mind: to assess the needs of the population and to provide a conceptual framework for the delivery service personnel study in Phase II and the workshops in Phase III.

Information Practitioner Study

Phase II involved the Information Practitioner Study; its purposes were to:

- assess how well information practitioners cope with the approach developed out of Phase I data;
- begin to explore practitioner use of communications as tools in the practitioner client interaction; and
- provide a base, with Phase I results, for developing training programs in Phase III.

For this survey 170 representatives of community social service delivery workers and 126 library workers were selected.

They completed a questionnaire about their perceptions of their clientele; ideas for delivery system design, training programs, and communication problems; reactions to findings of Phase 1; and characteristics about their agency.

Data were analyzed separately for the human service delivery personnel and library workers. This is because the tasks of the library personnel are more consistent and focused on information than those of the human services personnel.

Development of Training Modules

Following analyses of all data, and cross analyses between Phase I and Phase II findings, project staff developed training modules to provide professionals with the information learned in the earlier studies and strategies for dealing with the needs identified.

2.3: Staffing

This project was staffed with primarily part-time individuals including: an administrator, librarian, three research analysts, clerical help, and 15 consultants participating at various stages.

2.4: Problems

No major problems were reported by project staff.

2.5: Relationship to Other Projects

The relationship between this project and library networking or cooperatives efforts was not planned, nor was it considered to be especially relevant to this study. Participants in Phase III workshops included librarians and the library directors of public libraries involved in library networks, but in no case was direct interaction with a network required.

There were, however, informal relationships among research and demonstration projects which included this project. The Project Director called this interaction or "informal sharing."

She was in contact with: the Ruth Katz project in Colorado concerning training library personnel in isolated areas via videotape; Tom Childers about his project concerning information needs of blue collar workers; Jose Orlando Toro about non-traditional study; and others concerning the public library approach and college entrance examinations. Federal officials did discuss coordination of the project with other projects, and this did result in some changes. In relation to the Federal role, the assistant investigator suggested that the Federal Government "encourage people and resources to go and visit other projects [and] not just provide references to other materials."

2.6: Dissemination

Dissemination of project results has been effected through journal articles, presentation of papers to professional associations, ERIC, and USOE.

2.7: Key Findings

Key findings of the Urban Information Needs Project may be summarized as follows:

- Needs Assessment:
    - Diversity of Information needs as perceived by potential clientele is large, and extremely diversified.
    - Needs change with time.
    - Fulfillment of needs will require a creative approach to the concept of information systems and will need to be dynamic to be responsive to continually changing client needs.
- Information Practitioners' Survey:
    - Practitioners were best able to treat situations according to previous experience and practice rather than uniquely.
    - Practitioners over-emphasized information.
    - Practioners focused on the solution their institutions were organized to deliver, rather than on generic solutions, or on outside sources of assistance.

  - Practitioners had a wide variety of problems in using different communications media.
  - Practitioners chose those communications methods they were in a habit of using, rather than selecting the most appropriate one.

- Implications for Training:
  - There is a need for comprehensive training in the "client-in-situation" approach, so that practitions can tailor their help to the clients' individual needs.
  - There is a need for training in communications skills to help practitioners determine individual needs.
  - Just as clients need an individualized approach in obtaining services, practitioners need an individualized approach in obtaining training.
  - In Phase I, citizens indicated difficulty in accessing systems. In Phase II, practitioners indicated difficulties in their attempts to mold citizens' needs to fit existing systems. Thus, an alternative system may be warranted to bridge this gap.

These findings fed into the design of Phase III, the purposes of which were to: develop a set of training materials, field test the materials and revise them, and disseminate them as widely as possible. These activities included bringing together a panel of technical advisors to assist in drawing suggested direction for training modules from the findings of the surveys and to outline the contents of the modules. Next, a set of ten modules was developed and field tested. Currently the project is entering into its dissemination activities.

2.8: Impact/Replication

The Project Director undertook this project because of an interest in human service delivery, and libraries were an aspect of human services with which she was familiar. During the year immediately following the project, the Project Director and Assistant Investigator planned to disseminate information about the projects and perhaps conduct some training based on the research findings. At the time this report was prepared the project was almost complete with only the production and distribution of the final report of Phase III remaining.

The original project objectives were written with little involvement of persons other than the Project Director. In Phases II and III the implementation required the involvement of many groups. The Project Director feels that the project met its objectives better than was expected because the development of theoretic structure allowed for the redesign of libraries to make them more responsive to the public. Consequently, this factor enhanced the success.

Phase I and II were research-oriented, and Phase III was used as a demonstration of the principles developed in research. The Phase III final report contains the actual training modules which were designed to incorporate the results of the research phases with public libraries, information and referral services, and service agencies. Any replication of Phase III would involve replicating the workshops, and should include familiarization with Phases I and II so that a complete understanding of the background is obtained. Resources necessary for replication include: funding for publicity, development of materials, and the three to four person-months of labor.

3: IMPACT OF THE HEA II-B LIBRARY RESEARCH AND DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM ON THIS PROJECT

This section presents the perceptions of the key project staff toward the role that the HEA II-B Research and Demonstration Program and its requirements had on the Urban Information Needs Project and on library research in general.

3.1: Grant History

According to the Project Director this project was originally proposed to USOE in 1970, but was rejected because of a lack of funds. A second proposal, submitted in 1974, was funded, as were subsequent proposals in 1975 and 1976.

The Project Director is familiar with the HEA II-B Library Research and Demonstration Program. She plans to submit future proposals most likely in the topic areas of needs assessments, developing service patterns, and conducting and designing training programs. These future proposals are apt to be associated in some manner with the results of this three-phase project.

The Federal HEA II-B Research and Demonstration Program provided approximately $210,000 over the three year period. Except for matching computer funds and matching funds on the Project Director's salary by the University of Washington, the HEA II-B Library Research and Demonstration Program was the sole source of funds for the project. No other attempt was made to supplement these funds. The estimates for manpower, which were the most costly component, were accurate for Phases II and III. For Phase I, where the original estimates were low, the Project Director donated the additional time needed to complete the key tasks.

3.2: Monitoring and Technical Assistance

There were several comments made about the Federal level management of the project. One person thought that a forceful Regional Program Officer could help get information about what types of research funds are available. Another person commented about the excessive paperwork requirements, feeling that 25-35 percent of the project expenditures of time were devoted to reports.

3.3: Perceptions of Policy and Recommendations for Future Changes

The Project Director, when asked about the selection of HEA II-B Library Research and Demonstration Program projects for funding, suggested the following procedure for decisionmaking. A short synopsis about the project should be written by the project investigaotors. This should be disseminated to a large number of reviewers, perhaps through inclusion in the Library Journal, so that all in the field could respond. The Project Director feels that the profession is very open minded. Its members are "renaissance minded and they care." This is considered a strength of the current method being used to select applications for funding under the HEA II-B Library Research and Demonstration Program. A weakness is the "lack of cohesiveness, direction and philosophical underpinnings. There is a susceptibility to political capriciousness." Additionally, a need to search out innovative researchers exists.

3.4: Future Directions

Perhaps it is reflective of the findings of the Urban Information Needs project that the questions which urban residents are asking are not reflected in the methods and materials traditionally supplied by libraries. One person involved heavily with this project commented about future professional directions: "We do something because we can, rather than asking if we should be doing it. Librarians are not viewing themselves as service providers. They are more material oriented." This person also commented that the question should not be what is the Federal role, but, "What are the needs of the profession?"

The Project Director endorses the concept of multi-year funding, prefacing her comments with the opinion that "all research projects should have an initial design component." Adding this component to a research project would require that the project take more than one year to complete. This would enable the project to establish the groundwork necessary to continue. It would also permit USOE to reassess the appropriateness of the project. This was echoed by other respondents: there should be a "built-in component to do something, Office of Education funds are basic but they don't do followup."

One person commented about the differences between research and demonstration. It was felt that the Federal Government should fund the greatest possible variety in research, but the funding of demonstrations should, perhaps, have an overall direction. This seems contradictory to the comments of others who regarded the value of an attached demonstration component to research projects to be high.

One library director who was involved with the project sees the Federal role as one of assisting coordination with other information referral units. The urban situation demonstrates: 1) there must be a separation of the building from the service; 2) there must be changes in the organizational structure; and 3) there must be a training ground provided for future administrators. This will revolve on key personalities and joint governmental control. The Federal Government must continue to fund research which broadens the horizons of the profession and what they might be able to do. The Federal Government must continue to fund demonstrations which can be articulated in more measurable terms. They must foster coordination among services which are related. The Federal Government should also actively participate in the dissemination of research results.

HEA II-B

LIBRARY RESEARCH AND DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM CASE STUDY

Project Title:	Library School Education Program Without Walls
Project Director:	Martha Boaz
Sponsoring Agency:	Library School, University of Southern California
Period of Performance:	1975-1977
Funding Amount:	1975 - $86,000 1976 - $44,900
Location:	University of Southern California, Los Angeles, California

INTRODUCTION

The Library School Education Program Without Walls was designed to offer an opportunity for independent, self-paced study toward a goal of a Master of Science degree in Library Science and Information Technology. It was aimed at persons who, because of heavy financial and family obligations, job responsibilities, or personal reasons, were unable to attend classes in the traditional, scheduled formal on-campus study. Study modules were designed by the regular faculty. Separate study modules were designed for each course. These modules could then be used by the enrolled students on a self-paced basis to complete the course. As part of the project, the modules were implemented in classrooms and results, in terms of student achievement and student reactions, were compared to results obtained in traditional classrooms. The project was based at the University of Southern California, and the Project Director was Martha Boaz, Dean of the Library School. The preparation and presentation of self-paced modules was the specific task of the project.

This report describes this HEA II-B Library Research and Demonstration Program project, and summarizes the perceptions of the project staff about the HEA II-B Program. Section 2 presents a history of the project, and section 3 discusses the key staff's assessments of HEA II-B.

2: HISTORY OF THE PROJECT

This section describes the background of the Library Program Without Walls Project, its development, its outcomes, and its impact.

2.1: Objectives of the Project

The goal of the Library Program Without Walls was to provide an interdisciplinary, independent, self-paced professional educational program in library science for those persons who need and desire such a program with the ultimate result of recruiting and educating more people into the library profession. Specific objectives were to:

- Provide opportunities for independent study to these persons who, for financial, family or personal reasons, cannot pursue traditional, regularly scheduled courses of study;
- Allow individuals to pursue a degree or continuing education program in a manner and under more convenient circumstances;
- Assist persons to get an education who must integrate their education with their ongoing lives;
- Offer opportunities for a mixed work-study program in order to help focus life patterns away from specifically compartmentalized time, age, and educational levels to more integrated normal mixtures of education and work at all ages and throughout a lifetime.
- Help professional, career-oriented individuals become more effective and more perceptive members of society;
- Develop a program which will assist individuals in their self-enrichment goals to become more knowledgeable, imaginative, creative, critical, and useful people;
- Provide educational opportunities to persons who wish to take responsibility for their own learning;
- Instill a desire for continued education and to provide skills that will enable the student to pursue independent, self-enrichment study beyond this particular program;
- Provide opportunities for research about independent study and evaluation of the independent, self-paced study curriculum as compared with the regular traditional program;
- Serve as a prototype professional school in this experimental pilot program designed to assist in supplying the future information needs of society;
- Place strong emphasis on student self-direction in learning, and, at the same time maintain close teaching-learning relationships between students, teachers, and other people; and
- Produce not "finished" graduates but life-long learners.

2.2: Methodology

The project spanned two academic years--one for development and a second for evaluation. The Project Director for this study, as Dean of the Library School, was able to enlist the cooperation of the staff and marshall the resources of the Library School to accommodate the project and the evaluation. The activities may be described as falling into three major categories: preparation of materials, implementation, and evaluation.

The project was begun in September 1975. Publicity announcements about the program were issued to newspapers, to a mailing list of libraries and library organizations in California, and to national library journals. The Director of the project met with the faculty members and an Associate Dean interested in and willing to work on the project. Meetings were held frequently until the projects got underway. The early sessions were devoted to planning and policy decisions. Later there were reports on programs and problems and future plans.

Course outlines and modules were prepared for the "self-paced" courses. Decisions were made as to how often exams would be given and a committee prepared instruments for evaluating the courses. A staff member with a special background in testing was involved in the design of the evaluation instruments, and faculty members gave separate and individual reports and reactions to their own courses and to the program in general. These are described in detail below.

Preparation of Materials

In order to fulfill the objectives, the faculty attempted to focus on new approaches to teaching and teaching methods. Faculty members developed outlines and comprehensive modules for each course. Audiovisual instructional materials were also developed, and the faculty and staff involved in the project met frequently for consultation and planning. Each participating instructor used the following procedures in developing materials.

- Outlines, modules and study guides were prepared for each of the independent, self-paced courses.
- Supplementary enrichment materials were developed for the courses.
- Refined tests were prepared to measure the self-paced as well as the traditional learning which took place in the classes.
- Faculty members teaching in this project met with the director of the program, in committee session, to review and plan the work.

Classroom Implementation

The following steps were taken in the implementation of the materials in the classrooms:

- Publicity announcements about the Library School Educational Program Without Walls were issued, with notices being sent to newspapers, to a mailing list of libraries and organizations in the State, to national library journals, and to the alumni of the Library School.
- A professor from another department of the University, a specialist in study skills, lectured to each class at its first meeting and gave suggestions about how to proceed in an independent self-paced study program.
- The courses which were offered in the program included:
    - History of Books and Printing;
    - Information Sources: Social Sciences;
    - Information Sources: Sciences;
    - Selection and Acquisition of Library Materials; and
    - Information Systems for Library Service.

  Seventy-six students were enrolled in the fall and 100 in the spring classes, with a total of 176 for the year.

  The classes were offered in several time frames: late afternoon, evening, and Saturday.

- Faculty members teaching the courses met periodically with the Dean and with the Associate Dean to discuss plans, problems, and progress. There was an exchange of ideas and considerable discussion about the advantages and disadvantages of the "self-paced" format.

Formative Evaluation/Field Testing

Forms were prepared to evaluate the materials developed and administered in the special program testing and evaluation. The purpose of using these forms was to get feedback from the students as to the strengths and weaknesses of the courses. In one of the self-paced courses a comparison was made with the same courses offered in the traditional mode. Faculty members who taught the courses also gave both oral and written informal evaluations of the program.

The following tasks were performed for the evaluation, using an experimental design:

- Periodic tests and examinations were given in each course, and students' learning and performance were compared with that of students in the regular degree program.
- Refined pretests of relevant preparation were developed for each of the classes. These tests were screened for items which were judged to reflect significant advantage to the self-paced or to the control-normal classroom approach.
- Posttests were also administered.

For the evaluation the course credits, tuition, and admission requirements were the same as those required for the regular courses. The main difference was the time frame. The classes met less frequently, and students were given outlines, directives, and assignments which they did on a more independent, self-directed basis than in a class which usually meets two or three times a week. Students were required to fulfill requirements and pass examinations as students do in the classes which met on a regular basis.

Results of the field testing were used to make recommendations for changing the Without Walls program and materials in future implementation efforts.

2.3: Staffing

The project had full-time staff members, and several part-time in addition to the faculty participants. No problems arose because of lack of staff, although assignments for the faculty members and other types of problems did occur as explained in the next section.

2.4: Problems

Several problems surfaced during the course of this project, both administrative and technical. At least one faculty member, during the first year of funding, attempted to design the study modules as the term progressed. This was not very successful and the faculty member was not included in the project during the second year. The other faculty members attempted to prepare the study modules prior to the beginning of the term. This was a burden either to be borne in addition to a full course load of summer classes, or when the faculty member was actually not required to be on campus until fall and had other obligations during this time. In addition, during the terms included in the project funding period, these courses were taught as an overload. This was somewhat resented by the faculty.

Another, more serious, problem was the poor choice of a media consultant to the project. The purpose of the position was to provide assistance to the faculty in the preparation of audiovisual aids for the students. The consultant provided little assistance and was released from employment. Because of the self-paced, individualized instruction, it was assumed that multi-media formats would prove particularly valuable. Lack of appropriate assistance and the lengthy amount of time required to develop programs in different media resulted in the production of a relatively small number of items. Some of these items have since been incorporated into the regular curriculum, some have simply gone into storage. In general, they were not as enthusiastically received as was expected.

2.5: Evaluation and Key Findings

Because the evaluation of this project was a part of the overall project plan (in that it included a comprehensive field test which served a formative evaluation function), the findings and results of evaluation activities are intertwined, as described below.

There were administrative requirements and other obstacles which seemed to limit the project in achieving its objectives. The University required that the courses be included in the regular academic calendar. So while the program was to be "self-paced," there were some very definite limits. Also, the requirements for a mid-term and final to be given to the class as a group were still maintained. The project was authorized for funding in the middle of the summer, causing administrative problems. While the teaching faculty had known about the grant application, until it was approved by USOE, nothing was done in the way of designing modules for the course. The lack of knowledge about funding made it "hard to teach faculty to do planning," [the project staff was unable to prepare faculty to teach in accordance with the project design].

Another problem was the fact that self-paced methods of learning experiences are consonant to only some students. The students enrolled in the courses were queried in pretests about previous exposure to self-paced learning methods but enrollment was not limited to those students who were already aware of the method and comfortable with it. Thus, there were some students who were subsequently disappointed in the methods, according to their comments on posttests.

In only one case was the self-paced course offered concurrently with the regular course by the same instructor. Comparisons of test scores by the project staff indicated that changes in levels of knowledge were equal. It was the consensus among faculty involved in this project that approximately equal learning resulted from all the self-paced courses when compared with the regular curriculum.

The fact that the actual enrollment profile of self-paced students did not vary significantly from that of the students enrolled in the regular curriculum was not taken as a sign of failure to meet the goals of the project. Indeed the feeling of some seemed to be that regularly enrolled students took these courses because their availability in that particular semester met student needs. The flexibility of scheduling the courses offered was not the reason why students entered. The independent, self-paced courses were offered the first semester of the project in the late afternoon and evening, but regular curriculum courses were also available at these times. Later the self-paced courses were available in "block" sessions on Saturdays from 8:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. These were particularly well received according to the course evaluations given by students. One faculty member who participated in the intensive Saturday schedule commented that he used his regular course outline on Saturdays. He just included several days work on the single day. There was some question whether, in fact, the well-received intensive block sessions were not, in fact, quite opposite to the idea of a self-paced program.

2.6: Replication/Impact/Dissemination

It was hoped that curriculum materials which had been prepared for the courses could be duplicated and distributed to off-campus locations such as other universities and public libraries. This would have provided easier access to students who lived at some distance from the Library School. The ability to launch such a program would have also provided the basis for assessing the replicability of the project. However, the off-campus program was not begun, largely because of the lack of appropriate media technical assistance and the fact that materials were only available at the Library School library.

The project seemed to be responsive to the training needs of the community as shown by the fact that the publicity about the program resulted in 300 requests for information. But, considering that materials were only available on campus, the traditional academic calendar was maintained, the usual requirements for regularly scheduled class meetings (albeit less frequent), the requirements for mid and final term exams were unaltered, and the enrollment did not, to any large degree, reflect the intended user group, it is questionable as to whether there was significant difference between the project and the regularly offered curriculum.

3: IMPACT OF THE HEA II-B LIBRARY RESEARCH AND DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM ON THE PROJECT

The perceptions of key staff members about the role of the HEA II-B Library Research and Demonstration Program are summarized in this section.

3.1: Grant History

The project was funded the first time a grant application was submitted to the HEA II-B Library Research and Demonstration Program. Other research and demonstrations proposals, submitted by the Project Director in 1972 and 1977, were not funded. The Project Director was clearly attuned to grantsmanship, having submitted other proposals and planning to submit more in the future. She was particularly apt to submit proposals for funding under the HEA II-B Library Research and Demonstration Program. If the grants are replaced with contracts, she would probably still participate in the Program. The University has a development office with a research component which the Project Director feels is very helpful in the development of proposals.

3.2: Monitoring and Technical Assistance

This project had little interface with the USOE Project Officer. The project was visited once for purposes of evaluating the project. The Project Officer asked questions of the staff and talked with students, but no written feedback was ever provided. However, an indication of the Project Officer's opinion of the project was that he urged the Project Director to write an article about the project because it was a particularly significant effort.

Several respondents commented on the role of the Federal Government in library and information services. One person felt that efforts at library cooperation and networking should be coordinated. "This seems to be an obvious Federal role." Another person felt that one objection to the HEA II-B Research and Demonstration Program was that the value of the projects is not questioned by USOE after the projects are completed. He felt that experimentation is very valuable, and this "extra" money provides impetus to start projects. He felt, for example, that this project should have been funded longer to allow duplication of media and further development of materials. Another project member felt that better monitoring by the Federal Government was needed.

3.3: Perceptions of Policy and Recommendations for Changes

Several key staff members had reactions to the manner in which funding decisions are made for the HEA II-B Research and Demonstration Program and the Federal Government as a whole.

The Project Director commented that it is very important to know early if funding is to be received for projects. She voiced concern about the effect of a new Federal Fiscal Year which starts in October, because this affects university programs based on an academic calendar beginning in September. The Project Director also felt that it is important to fund projects for more than one year to allow for advanced planning for equipment, and especially staff.

Regarding the objective of the HEA II-B Library Research and Demonstration Program to conduct needs assessments to determine needs for new service patterns, the Project Director's opinion was that the guidelines indicate what is being funded and the proposals have to fit them.

The Project Director had several comments regarding improvement of the Program at the Federal level. She felt that they should fund where there would be very practical application of findings. Projects should include information about management operations. They should be looking into the future of libraries and library education to anticipate and plan for change, and actually put those changes into operation. Research is needed concerning management and use of resources. She feels that the guidelines for HEA II-B should be left a little more open to allow greater diversity in the types of projects which it funds:

> "Perhaps what is needed is a national research institute to study the library and information needs of the people and to develop techniques and programs. Librarians, scientists, businessmen and futurists need to work together. Cooperation is also needed with schools of communication. Decisions are made by people without information...the profession needs leadership."

3.4: Future Directions

Some members of the Library School faculty, including the Project Director, commented on the future development of libraries and research regarding information services.

One faculty member who participated in the project was of the opinion that programs such as the HEA II-B Research and Demonstration Program are beneficial because librarians are not traditionally inclined to experimentation. Specifically, he felt that "library schools' faculties tend to lag behind in research and tend to be reactive to the employment marketplace guidelines regarding curriculum." He thought that those in positions to hire graduates of the Library school programs should define the topics to be included in the curriculum. Developments in the profession are coming from outside the library schools from places like the Ohio College Library Center and the Library of Congress. The profession seems to be going in many directions at the same time. There is a lack of leadership and no place to focus on for leadership." He felt that individuals and organizations should do what they can, though, before depending on the Federal Government. "There seems to be a lack of dynamic people in the field." A good source of information resources is not in the libraries' traditional fields. The profession lacks guidance and direction.

The library school faculty expressed hopes that the Federal Government might, in the future, have better monitoring of projects in progress and better evaluations when the projects are completed. There was an expressed feeling that the library profession lacks direction and leadership and a hope that the Federal Government might provide one or both.

HEA II-B

LIBRARY RESEARCH AND DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM CASE STUDY

Project Title:	The Development of a Model Interdisciplinary Continuing Education Program for Librarians
Project Director:	Marilyn Gell
Principal Investigator:	Mary Sage
Sponsoring Agency:	Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments (COG)
Period of Performance:	1975
Funding Amount	$34,406
Location:	Washington, D.C.

I: INTRODUCTION

With libraries moving into a variety of social service activities, such as human services information delivery, and also serving a continually changing constituency in a changing social and political environment, professionals on library staffs are becoming more and more concerned about their need to be familiar with the basic principles (at a minimum) of a variety of social science fields. These might include: education, social work, urban issues, and environment. Conversely, the affairs of libraries are no longer the domain of a narrow field of disciplines such as education, librarianship, and publishing. The scope of traditional fields of training for librarians needs to be augmented with such areas as planning, public administration, and economics so that librarians are better able to meet their changing roles. To meet the growing need of librarians for interdisciplinary training that would address the increasing complexity of their tasks, the Librarians' Committee of the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments designed and conducted a project to develop a model for a continuing education program for interdisciplinary education.

The Metropolitan Council of Governments was awarded a one-year grant under the Library Research and Demonstration Component of the Higher Education Act (HEA II-B) to develop and demonstrate a model interdisciplinary education curriculum for librarians. The grant was funded in 1975 for $34,406. After the termination of grant activities in 1976, the project became self-supporting. The Project Director was Marilyn Gell; the Principal Investigator was Mary Sage.

This report summarizes the results of a site visit to the project during which the Principal Investigator and two participants in the study's demonstration project were interviewed. In addition, the Project's final report served as a source for much of the information about the project's content and activities.[1] The project is described in detail in section 2. The perceptions of key staff about the HEA II-B Library Research and Demonstration Program is the subject of section 3.

2: HISTORY OF THE PROJECT

This section describes the objectives, methodology and outcomes of the Interdisciplinary Education Project.

2.1: Project Objectives

The Principal Investigator explained that the rationale for undertaking the Project was based on the need to increase:

- The effectiveness of libraries in specific areas; and
- The effectiveness of librarians.

These needs were identified through a literature review and a series of informal ad hoc interviews of librarians at professional meetings, conferences, and conventions--both National and local. The data pointed to the need for librarians to acquire information and skills outside the traditional library experiences. It was felt by almost all interviewees that, traditionally, library schools do not stress the acquisition of management skills. At best they offer introductory library administration courses with more emphasis on the management of information (i.e., acquisition, cataloging, and referencing of books and other media) than on management of the system (supervisory skills, public relations, budgeting, etc.).

The primary goal of the project was to develop and evaluate a continuing education curriculum intended for library personnel and designed to encourage cooperation and communication among librarians and between librarians and those in other disciplines.

---

[1] Sage, Mary: Continuing Library Education: An Interdisciplinary Approach; December, 1976.

While the transfer of specific information and skills in given subject areas was an important aspect of the workshop program, equally important was the goal of developing interlibrary and interagency communication.

Specific project objectives which supported the achievement of the goal were to:

- Increase library effectiveness through improved staff competencies in specific subject areas;
- Increase specific competencies of the librarians participating in the program;
- Examine a variety of methods in the delivery of continuing education activities;
- Ascertain the effectiveness of the Council of Governments as the sponsoring agency for continuing education activities; and
- Produce and disseminate findings and recommendations from the project for its possible replication.

These objectives provided guidelines for both the planning and evaluation of the project. They were instrumental in determining priorities in content, participant makeup, and instructional mode.

Changes in the Project's objectives did occur due to changes in emphasis and further clarification of direction. Initially, there was an attempt to design a project which would be both research and demonstration in nature. It was not realistic nor feasible to conduct adequate research on the continuing education needs of librarians and at the same time develop and implement a model which would address the dissemination of information to and needs for acquisition of skills of working librarians. The decision was made to concentrate on the latter.

The Project staff, the Advisory Board, the sponsoring agency, and selected library educators and subject specialists were primarily responsible for defining objectives. The Advisory Board offered recommendations and participated in the review and evaluation process. At the mid-year meeting, for instance, they reviewed the Project's progress and discussed possible changes. Training division heads within the sponsoring agency were contacted and asked to share knowledge and skills in various subject areas.

2.2: Methodology

The project depended heavily, at all stages of development, on the input of potential clients, professionals in a variety of fields,the resources of the Council of Governments (COG), and others in an effort to provide an interdisciplinary approach to interdisciplinary education. Planning made use of the COG Librarians' Committee as well as other COG departments, Project Advisory Committee input and interviews with potential clients. For example, conferences and workshops were planned with the help of COG's Metropolitan Training Institute. Workshop topics were selected based on the input of persons outside the library field who were concerned with the library's role in society, reports in the literature, librarians, and library administrators. A preliminary needs assessment, referred to earlier, was used to generate a complete list of topics, from which several were selected. These were:

- communications and techniques;
- advertising and public relations;
- personnel administration;
- consumer protection information;
- planning and budgeting; and
- supervisory skills.

Once the topics were selected, participants for each workshop were recruited from a variety of fields to facilitate interaction and the sharing of knowledge and experience.

The model program consisted of six two and three day workshops held over a period of seven months. Course planning was done by the training coordinator for each topic with advice of the Principal Investigator. Course planning took three weeks and was accomplished two months in advance of each workshop. In the two weeks prior to each workshop, the coordinator worked with participants and instructors to finalize the program. Participants were surveyed as to their expectations and needs, and topics they wished to see discussed at their workshop. The training coordinator and instructor met prior to each workshop to coordinate topics, and all instructors met prior to implementation to coordinate topics, coverage and techniques, and to discuss the particular relationship of the topic to librarianship. (Instructors were not necessarily familiar with the library profession)

During each workshop, the coordinator attended as observer and met informally with the instructor and participants to solicit feedback and provide suggestions for modification. Evaluations were performed for each session and will be described later in this report.

2.3: Staffing

The program was developed under the direction of the Chief of Library Programs for COG. It was staffed by a library planner who served as the training coordinator (the Principal Investigator). Project staff met frequently to discuss program development and formulate strategies for achieving objectives. The designated Project Director served as a consultant, guiding the direction and helping to maintain the original intent of the project.

2.4: Problems

There were no major problems in the completion of this project reported by respondents. While staff was adequate for the objectives of the project as planned, lack of staff and resources did restrict the ability of the project to probe more deeply into needs in developing programs, and more extensively into long-range effects in evaluating those programs developed.

2.5: Project Evaluation

Evaluation of the training programs was essential to the creation of the ultimate model. Evaluation procedures were built into every project component--from informal feedback about project plans to formal and informal surveys to obtain staff and participant reactions to the programs.

The project was evaluated in the following ways:

- Surveys of intended beneficiaries were conducted annually.
- Informal feedback from intended beneficiaries. This was a continuous process. Feedback was solicited from individuals, organizations, and institutions such as library systems. This would include directors and staff of systems, members of private professional associations, and all types of libraries.
- Reviews by project staff occurred on an annual basis, the last one being October 1976.
- Reviews by the sponsoring agency (Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments) were conducted once a year, the last one being in December 1976.
- Formal reviews by the U.S. Office of Education on an annual basis, the last one being in December 1976. According to the Project Director, the Office of Education never did respond to the Project's request for feedback on their review. The Project Director stated that this was an example of the Office of Education's overall inability to respond to grantees (see section 3).

As a result of this evaluation process, the project decided to focus on demonstration aspects of the project by developing straight model programs without drawing conclusions as opposed to a focus on testing different education models and topics which would be primarily a research activity.

2.6: Relationship to Other Projects

The projects' results and products are applicable to BARC, a library networking and/cooperative project in San Francisco, California. The Principal Investigator was not familiar with details of this project however and was not aware of other projects with similar programs. The project had no formal linkage with other training projects such as CLENE.

2.7: Dissemination

Information about this project has been disseminated through OLLR and ERIC, and more information is available in the event that others may be interested in replicating all or some portion of the project. The project also published and marketed a detailed document on the project. All of these activities were carried out at the end of the project. The project staff and the sponsoring agency have performed very useful tasks related to dissemination, but the U.S. Office of Education has not been actively involved, in any formal or informal manner, in "spreading the word" about the project.

Dissemination, in the form of publicity to encourage applications by qualified participants, was an integral part of the design and implementation of each workshop.

2.8: Results/Key Findings

The ultimate result of this project was a working model, which has been implemented as a full-scale, ongoing, self-supporting project by COG for interdisciplinary education for librarians. The recommended model may be summarized as follows:

- Topic Selection:
    - needs assessments are highly recommended
    - discussions with participants prior to workshops are also useful
- Liaison:
    - continual communication with participating libraries to maintain relevance to their continuing education priorities
- Advisory Committee
    - should provide a continuous communication link with the project for review, modification, and planning to help keep the project relevant to the community's needs
    - should have membership from participating libraries
    - should have membership from outside library community if such participants are to be included

- Instructors:
    - require experience in teaching adults and in interdisciplinary approaches
- - should be trained group facilitators who can guide problem-solving activities constructively
- Participants:
    - Program publicity should describe fully the intended target audience so that informal decisions about enrollments can be made.
    - Applications should include personal profiles so that participants may be selected to balance the backgrounds of all involved and create a positive group situation, in terms of representation.
    - should have interdisciplinary representation, geo-political representation, inter-type library representation and other social service provider representation.
- Course Content and Mode:
    - Students should be aware of content objectives prior to enrollment.
    - Problem-solving courses should have cognitive material as background to discussion.
    - Some materials should emphasize advance content.
    - Courses should emphasize practical application rather than theory.

2.9: Impact/Replication

From the Project Director's viewpoint, the impact the project had on its target population could be summarized as follows:

- It made individuals aware of the training needs of librarians.
- It improved abilities of librarians in certain areas of training, especially in management.

- It helped develop regional unity among libraries and made them aware of the need for the training of librarians.
- It provided an outline of how to put on this type of program.

One school librarian who participated in a workshop noted that "a librarian in a school environment may have a tendency to feel isolated because you are really not part of any department. Most often decisions have to be made alone." The workshop gave her a perspective on what to do when faced with decisionmaking for discussing the process, analyzing theories step-by-step, and providing excellent films, speakers, and designing small group exercises as an opportunity to apply theory. She noted that it would probably be difficult to measure the impact of the workshop on her workstyle, but stressed the importance of its making her aware that decisions could be made at the appropriate time. "There are things that some people say 'you ought to know,' but I didn't. It was all very useful. I tend to think that I was doing it the right way, but I found out there are other ways."

A second participant (also a librarian) indicated that she really "can't say that I'm doing things differently as a result of my participation in the one workshop." She was particularly interested in management theory and wanted an academic introduction to management within a library framework. The speakers with library experience made a difference because they had "a clear sense of realities and made no ridiculous assumptions." Probably the greatest impact of the workshop was the professional knowledge gained which she considers critical to one's professional development. "Almost every librarian has something to do with supervisory experience." Another advantage was opportunity to talk with librarians from varied backgrounds.

The project is considered by the Principal Investigator to have met its objectives better than expected. The concentration on various aspects of management applicable within a library environment has produced a significant and consistent response from the metropolitan Washington library community. The fact that, since the end of the first year's operation, 200 persons have been willing to pay for workshops is considered evidence of the success of the project. The Arlington County Public Library,[1] for example, has encouraged participation by assuming full responsibility for costs and providing its personnel with administrative leave.

In contrast, the project reported that Prince George's County[1] had not traditionally funded external continuing education activities or indicated a willingness to institute a more liberal leave policy. In that organization, unless a prospective participant is able to assume full responsibility and use limited annual leave, the chances of enrollment in a workshop are slim.

Thus far, replication of this project has not been extensive. Those likely to replicate this project would include academic and public libraries and Federal Government agencies. The project has not developed procedures for assisting organizations, and the degree of assistance they would be able to provide would depend on whether their services were being paid (i.e., would have to be paid to set up workshops, or, if no resources were available would consult with organization contact person via telephone or in person). The cost of replicating the project would be approximately $35,000, which would cover costs of consultants to teach, an administrator and miscellaneous fees. If this is an accurate estimate, then very little of what was developed by this project could be transferred to a new setting.

3: IMPACT OF THE HEA II-B LIBRARY RESEARCH AND DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM ON THIS PROJECT

This section discusses the perceptions of key project staff as to the role that the HEA II-B Library Research and Demonstration Program has played in the completion of the Interdisciplinary Education Project.

---

[1] Arlington and Prince Georges Counties are located in the Washington Metropolitan area and are members of the Council of Governments.

3.1: Grant History

The amount of the project grant ($34,406) was considered adequate. (The only limitation was that the maximum consultant fee was too low which prohibited, in many cases, the hiring of top-notch consultants.) At the conclusion of the first project year, the success of the programs offered, and a survey of participants who indicated that they--or their employers--would be willing to pay a fee for participating led project staff to the decision to make the program self-supporting. Thus, no application was made for a continuation of its HEA II-B Library Research and Demonstration Program grant. The project is still in operation and is self-supporting.

Currently, the project is in a state of transition because of the hiring of a new department head. While it is yet to be determined whether the new administration would be interested in submitting grant applications for Program funds, in the opinion of the Principal Investigator there is no interest in doing so within the next two years.

3.2: Monitoring and Technical Assistance

Project monitoring activities by Federal officials were limited to written reports submitted every three months by the project to the Office of Education. Even though the point of contact at the Federal level was Washington, D.C. (the project's location), the Principal Investigator indicated that USOE never responded to the project's reports. While the Principal Investigator did discuss adherence to Federal rules and regulations and use of existing resources with Federal officials, these discussions did not result in any changes in the project. Discussions with officials resulted in the project being given an extension of three months to submit a final report. Overall, there has been little interaction between the project and Federal officials.

On three occasions, project staff visited the Office of Education for the purpose of obtaining technical assistance. On one occasion the project staff had requested an evaluation of its final report. The Principal Investigator indicated that the feedback was useless because what the project needed--and had requested earlier, but not received,--was assistance in formulating the final report. On another occasion, the project staff engaged in a brainstorming session with USOE officials in hopes of acquiring some guidance. But, once again, the Principal Investigator did not feel that she got the needed help and rated the activity as useless. At one point the Office of Education did refer the Principal Investigator to another project for assistance which was considered useful. However, in spite of occasionally valuable assistance from USOE, the Principal Investigator commented that "they don't always hear what you say you need in terms of assistance and often the assistance they give you is of no benefit."

The quality of assistance given by the sponsoring agency (Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments) was good. The Principal Investigator indicated that the project had been given some good advice by outside consultants, even though in some instances it might not have been the direction the project would have chosen. Overall, assistance provided to the project resulted in some minor technical changes, nothing major, according to respondents.

3.3: Perceptions of Policy and Recommendations for Changes

The Principal Investigator felt that she would definitely be more interested in participation in the HEA II-B Research and Demonstration Program if it offered more specific information to prospective applicants. It is her understanding that it is the policy of USOE to avoid interfacing with proposal applicants until they are in the negotiation stages or have won the grant. Pointing out that this was a serious drawback of the Program, the Principal Investigator stressed the need for applicants to develop better interaction with knowledgeable HEA II-B Library Research and Demonstration Program staff. What would hopefully result from such interaction, she felt, would be opportunities to discuss and explore ideas and proposals within the framework of the Program's priorities. For example, applicants could have the option of submitting, for reaction by USOE, a preliminary proposal in the form of a one page working document prior to committing a large effort on a full proposal. This would be especially helpful to applicants who are not located in the Washington area.

The management of the HEA II-B Library Research and Demonstration Program can be improved at the Federal level by ensuring more active participation by USOE with responsiveness to grantees being stressed. This is an important factor that is seriously lacking in current Federal operations. What's more, the current method used by the U.S. Office of Education to select grant applications needs to be changed. As it is now, according to the Principal Investigator, proposals are sent out for review, even though decisions have already been made.[1/] She suggested that peer review carry more weight. Less emphasis on local, big names and more emphasis on the formation of a panel that more adequately represents the variety of the library and information science community is strongly recommended.

3.4: Future Directions

The Interdisciplinary Continuing Education Project has become an ongoing project of the sponsoring agency, COG. As such, its future seems secure for several years. An interesting feature of the project is the encouragement of participants to not only spread the work to their colleagues, but also to attempt to replicate the workshops at their home-bases. Guidelines for doing so are available, as is support from COG staff. The fact that the project is now self-supporting attests, not only to its success, but also the

---

[1/] At the present time, the Program awards grants solely on the basis of reviewer ratings.

apparent success of the concept of providing "seed" money for research and demonstration. The impact of the project at the National level is less certain, however.

HEA II-B

LIBRARY RESEARCH AND DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM CASE STUDY

Project Title:	Study for the Design of an Optimum System for a Mail Order Book Delivery System in the State of Washington
Project Director:	Maryan E. Reynolds
Principal Investigator:	Mary Jane Reed
Sponsoring Agency:	Washington State Library Agency
Period of Performance:	July 1973 - June 1974
Funding Amount:	$7,760
Location:	University of Washington, Seattle, Washington

1: INTRODUCTION

Mail order book systems are utilized by public libraries to serve as delivery mechanisms for sparsely populated areas. In 1973 the State of Washington, through its State Library Agency, undertook a study to evaluate existing mail order operations among its libraries in order to design a statewide mail order delivery system. The State Library Agency was interested in learning what resources would be required to expand the successful operation of three local systems to other regions of the State in a statewide mail order system. At the time of project initiation, there was a realistic expectation that such a system would be implemented.

The project was conducted by a member of the State Library Agency staff, Ms. Mary Jane Reed, with the assistance of a consulting systems analyst, Hugh T. Vrooman. Completed in 1974, the final report presented a mathematical simulation model of a statewide mail order system. Because of subsequent budget cuts in the State, this system was never implemented, nor was it disseminated widely. However, when a new local library system was set up at the Fort Vancouver Regional Library in Washington, many of the principles learned from the study were implemented in the startup phases.

This report describes the Design of an Optimum Mail Order System Study (Mail Order System Study) in detail, focusing on the project staff's perceptions of the HEA II-B Library Research and Demonstration Program. Section 2 describes the design procedures, problems and outcomes of the project. Section 3 examines the impact that the HEA II-B Library Research and Demonstration Program has had on this project, and specifically, the role that Program requirements and management have played in the conduct of the mail order book system design project.

2: HISTORY OF THE PROJECT

2.1: Objectives

The Mail Order System Study in the State of Washington was conducted in order to meet its objectives to:

- Develop statewide mail order services;
- Evaluate alternative patterns for extended mail delivery;
- Present suggestions for methods to four districts applying for mail order services; and
- Develop methods for periodic evaluations of these mail order services.

These objectives were developed utilizing the input of library educators, State and local library personnel, researchers, consultants, advisory boards, and intended users of the system. They remained unchanged throughout the project.

2.2: Methodology

In order to design the statewide mail delivery system, the project first studied and evaluated three existing local systems, and then applied the techniques of mathematical modelling to project the most efficient system for covering the State. In the evaluation of the local systems, information was collected on: the operational techniques, cost projections, organization for policy and fiscal control, and methods for periodic evaluation.

The initial study tasks included reviews of literature on the subject and participation in the Conference on Books by Mail Service sponsored by the American Library Association. This information was later used as a comparative base for findings within Washington State.

The three existing mail order service centers in the State of Washington were examined onsite. Directors and staff members were interviewed, financial and statistical data were collected, and subsequent telephone calls and letters elicited additional information as required. The centers or systems that participated were the King-Pierce Counties, North Central Regional, and Spokane County Libraries.

The King-Pierce Counties System applied for State funds in 1971, but none were available, and in 1972 started their own mail order service. Pierce County runs the operation, with reimbursement from King County for service there. Each county reaches a population of approximately 15,000 households with the rural and home bound individuals as the main target. The mail order budget was $120,000 per year. Materials, circulated by the system, included paperbacks and large-type books, films, cassettes, and magazines. A catalog was distributed throughout the year, and revised every five months. The project ran smoothly and was fully staffed, rarely encountering more than a one-day backlog of requests.

The North Central Regional Library Mail Order Book System served a 15,000 square mile, five-county area. This system was one of the earliest mail order systems in the Nation and has been a leader in this library service. Start up costs, in 1968, were provided by a Library Services and Construction Act Grant. Three bookmobile centers have been phased out due to the mail system's success. Circulation of the catalog, currently 15,000 homes, is increasing. It has been found that such increases often prove to be a forerunner of new branch libraries where the service has encouraged demand and interest in the establishment of a local in-library service.

The Spokane Center was begun in 1971 with an LSCA grant allowing catalogs to be sent to nursing homes. Later, service was increased to include all elderly persons receiving State assistance, and then to families in the county receiving Aid to Families with Dependent Children assistance. Here mail order service was viewed as building use of libraries in general. Some books are returned in person, thereby bringing new patrons into the library. This system seems to have contacted a whole segment of previous non-users.

In addition to onsite observations of three mail order delivery centers, the investigators interviewed a number of librarians in Washington State, who provided helpful information and guidance. Furthermore, during the course of the study the Fort Vancouver Regional Library (Vancouver, Washington) began to offer mail service to portions of its service area. Considerable up-to-date information had been accumulated by the library, and this information was made available to the investigators. Experience in Washington State formed the main thrust of this study. Information from outside the State served to corroborate or modify the findings in Washington. Out-of-state operations which were especially relevant included operations in the States of Vermont, Pennsylvania, and New York because many of their service problems are similar to Washington's. Analysis of population distributions and educational level in the State was based on the 1970 U.S. Census and figures published by the State Office of Program Planning and Fiscal Management.

A major factor in the quality of any mail order service is the movement of packages via the U.S. Postal System. While the internal operations of the working centers offered a means for analyzing costs of such service, an analysis of mail delivery patterns was necessary in order to assess rapidity of service to the user. For an empirical test of postal delivery patterns, the three existing centers mailed packages to district library directors throughout the State, keeping records as to time en route from center to home and return.

The statistical data obtained in this empirical test provided input for the simulation model which described the interrelationships of components and procedures of the mail order delivery systems in a format that could be processed by computer. The generalized model was constructed on the basis of systems at the three operating centers, and the model was exercised to simulate service to the State's mail order delivery library users from a variety of alternative configurations of centers.

2.3: Staffing

The project was conducted by the Principal Investigator and the consultant who served as key staff. Support for the Principal Investigator's time was provided by the State Library Agency. The State Librarian served as Project Director, but was not involved substantially in the major tasks.

This project was staffed by one librarian and one librarian/administrator, one consultant, and one clerical worker. All were part-time. The amount of labor expended for this project was estimated to have been seven person-months.

2.4: Problems

According to the respondents, this study ran smoothly. No major problems were reported.

2.5: Evaluation

This project utilized a variety of approaches to project evaluation: a survey of users was conducted in July 1974; informal feedback was occasionally solicited from participants; the State Library Agency reviewed it in 1975; USOE conducted formal and informal reviews in 1974; and there were informal reviews of the project by the Regional Program Officer and others. Evaluations assisted the project staff in refining data collection techniques.

2.6: Relationship to Other Projects

No other known projects were studying the same problems at the time of the Mail Order Systems Study. The project staff did conduct background research into systems outside Washington State that were active in mail order delivery. Information from other sites was used only to assess local findings, and interaction with other sites was minimal.

The Appalachian Adult Education Center's (AAEC) HEA II-B Library Research and Demonstration Program sponsored project[1] did have some communication with the Mail Order System Study project about its results. An AAEC monograph contained a section on Mail Order Delivery Service, and Attributed co-authorship to the Principal Investigator.

---

[1] See case study in this volume.

2.7: Dissemination

Information about this project was disseminated through journal articles, papers delivered at conferences and through ERIC. For example, there were one or two articles in the Journal of Library Automation written by the Principal Investigator which referenced this project, but the focus of the articles was the technique of computer simulation which was used on the project. The Principal Investigator has received requests for copies of the final report which she refers to ERIC. Dissemination activities have been performed by USOE, ERIC, the State Library Agency, and the Project Director and staff. The Principal Investigator rated USOE's involvement in dissemination as useless, ERIC's as somewhat useful, the State Library Agency's as very useful, and the project staff's as useful.

She felt that better dissemination of the final report to State officials responsible for the State Library Agency budget would have improved the chances of the statewide mail order delivery system being funded and implemented. She saw the dissemination of information as the responsibility of the State Library Agency because the project was statewide in scope and in response to a request for information from the State Librarian. USOE should also have been involved in dissemination of information about projects which are funded under the HEA II-B Library Research and Demonstration Program.

2.8: Key Findings

The Mail Order Systems Study's observations of the internal operations of the three extant mail order centers resulted in a finding that they were quite similar. This was probably because the North Central Regional Library, the first working system, had been highly successful and had been adapted by the other centers when they became operational. There were some differences among the centers in policies on overdue materials and in filing, but overall, procedures were basically the same.

The staff members in all three centers were found to be enthusiastic about their service, and they have experienced a feeling of accomplishment from the work. Some misgivings were expressed by local staff as to the advisability of the statewide model utilizing a one-center system for mail order: a question of whether size would create inefficiency, possible delay, and difficulty in serving local and individual special needs. These objections were seen to have validity by the researchers but they were not mentioned by librarians in the survey who had not been involved in the mail order projects.

The existing local services appeared to be successful, as judged by reports obtained during the course of the project of user appreciation, continued requests, growth of allied services (i.e., reference), and demand for further local services. This success and enthusiasm in the local centers were the factors on which the justification for the present study was based.

Under existing funding patterns, all but 4.5 percent of Washington State citizens were estimated to have been served by public libraries--which should mean that nearly all Washington citizens could expect convenient access to library resources and information services for their self-enrichment, economic well-being, and entertainment. In actuality, a considerable portion of this group has been denied the opportunity to benefit because of domicile location or other factors preventing travel to a library.

The final report for this study summarized the findings as follows:

> Washington librarians are agreed that while the service is not an adequate substitute for strong comprehensive in-library programs, mail order delivery service does fill a clear need for specific individuals who cannot for various reasons come into the library, and furthermore is not in competition with regular library services but instead promotes the use of the libraries' other services. It is viewed as one of a gamut of techniques which enable library materials and services to be made available on a relatively equalized basis to all citizens regardless of location. This study does not question the value of this supplementary library service; the problems addressed are how and where does it fit in the gamut of services, and how it can be achieved most effectively on a statewide scale.

2.9: Impact/Replication

The Principal Investigator felt the project had very little impact on the target population, library patrons, because the system designed was never implemented. However, its results did establish standards for implementation in future projects. The project staff will make the computer model created for this project available with no restrictions to anyone who wants to use it in the future.

As noted earlier, during the completion of the project, a new mail order book delivery system at the Fort Vancouver Regional Library was started. The report of the Mail Order System and Study had some influence on this operation in the startup phases. Specifically, the detailed information about the cost of providing the service, the relative cost of mail order services compared to bookmobile service, and the recommendations in the report about the minimum amount of resources (funding, staff size, physical facilities, collection base size, etc.) necessary to start a mail order service were used to justify budgetary requests to the local government.

In addition, the Director of the North Central Regional Library system, which was studied as part of the project, requested more detailed results and findings about his operation. The Principal Investigator was not sure if this information was actually used to modify operations at the North Central Regional Library.

3: THE IMPACT OF HEA II-B LIBRARY RESEARCH AND DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM ON THIS PROJECT

This section of the Mail Order System Study project report summarizes comments about the role that the HEA II-B Library Research and Demonstration Program and its requirements have played in the project by key staff members who conducted the study, with particular emphasis on the comments of the Principal Investigator.

3.1: Grant History

The proposal for the design of the Washington State Mail Order Delivery System was submitted to USOE under the HEA II-B Library Research and Demonstration Program in 1973 and funded for approximately $7,760. The budget for this project was prepared and reviewed by the Principal Investigator, Advisory Council, State Library Agency, and the project consultant. Funds received from the HEA II-B Library Research and Demonstration Program were used to supplement funds received from State sources. Recently (in Fiscal Year 1977), the Principal Investigator submitted a second proposal, for approximately $20,000 which was funded. This second project will utilize similar methodologies to study networking and interlibrary loan operations.

In addition to the two projects which have been funded through the Program, the Principal Investigator would definitely like to submit proposals in the area of developing more efficient uses of resources in serving users, and is also interested in the areas of: needs assessments, innovative service patterns, and the development of new technologies, and new applications of technology. The supplanting of the grants program with more detailed requests for proposals would not affect this individual's plans for future submissions.

3.2: Monitoring Technical Assistance

Monitoring activities by USOE were limited to a review of the final report. During early contact with Federal officials, discussions about adherence to Federal rules and regulations resulted in some modification of procedures. A discussion about project problems was also held, resulting in an extension being approved for the project consultants.

The Principal Investigator voiced some doubts about the value of Federal monitoring and evaluation efforts because they were done for the most part after the project ended. Evaluation without the oppurtunity to modify seemed to her to be fruitless. The only feedback the project received from Federal officials was a USOE suggestion that the Principal Investigator submit another proposal.

Technical assistance was received during the project from USOE, and was rated as being somewhat helpful in the area of feedback on reports, and not helpful in the area of referral to other projects. Most of the assistance was provided by telephone, and it was rated as being occasionally directly related to the needs of the project. The Principal Investigator reported never having requested assistance from USOE.

Assistance received by outside consultants was thought to be very good; from the State Library Agency, good; and from regional and Federal program officers, fair. None of the assistance was reported as having changed anything in the project.

3.3: Perceptions of Present Policy and Recommendations for Changes

The Principal Investigator was favorably inclined towards the HEA II-B Library Research and Demonstration Program. She felt that the research and demonstration projects that are being conducted under this Program have been responsive to critical needs in the library community.

The Principal Investigator thought that research projects are more important than demonstration projects, but HEA II-B should fund both types, with research getting 70 percent of the funds, and demonstration the rest. She did not feel that multi-year projects should be funded unless they were evaluated each year.

The consultant to the project felt that evaluations of projects, with essentially technological content, were frequently performed by librarians with no expertise in technological fields. This opinion was also expressed by the Principal Investigator who felt that areas not familiar to the proposal readers were slighted. Both the Principal Investigator and consultant felt that there was adequate time provided to applicants to prepare their proposals.

The Principal Investigator saw a need for technological expertise in the library field and the need for modern management techniques including organizational structure analysis. There was also a feeling that libraries need better marketing. This was echoed by the consultant and the Project Director in commenting about the review panel for HEA II-B Library Research and Demonstration Program projects. The feeling was that librarians should either obtain more expertise in the computers and their library applications or recognize the need to call in experts as consultants when evaluating applications which concern technological techniques.

3.4: Future Directions

The Principal Investigator and consultant on this project indicated that a future course for the Program to explore is organizational structure. This reflects the fact that research was conducted in response to an expressed need, but the results were not applied because of lack of funds. The feeling was that better analysis of governmental organizations and power relationships affecting libraries would result in activities being better directed toward goals which are true, thereby avoiding wasted research efforts on projects not used. They also expressed the need for librarians and the USOE to search out the types of organizational relationships into which libraries should enter in order to best determine what real information needs are and how these needs can be met. With better direction for libraries available because of the effective interaction with other bureaucracies (governmental and private), wasted efforts would decrease and better service would result.

3.5: Summary/Conclusions

This was a small project with the potential for statewide impacts. In accordance with its objectives, the project produced a written report about a Design for an Optimum System for Mail Order Book Delivery System in the State of Washington. The impetus for the project was the expressed interest of the State Librarian in a statewide mail order book delivery system. Those persons most directly involved in the project were the Principal Investigator and a consultant. Both individuals expressed frustration about the poor level of knowledge in computer technologies in the library field. The project never had the direct application it was expected to have because the State never implemented the system. However, there was indirect benefit to at least one local system in the State which used the study's findings.

HEA II-B

LIBRARY RESEARCH AND DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM CASE STUDY

Project Title: Study and Development of an Automated Instructional Materials Handling Program

Project Director: Mildred Frary

Sponsoring Agency: Los Angeles City Unified School District

Period of Performance: 1970 - 1973

Funding Amounts:
1970 - $171,402
1971 - $234,102
1972 - $ 37,265
1973 - $ 12,150

Location:
Los Angeles City Unified School District,
Division of Special Services
Los Angeles, California 90015

1: INTRODUCTION

Project AIMS (Automated Instructional Materials) was launched by the Los Angeles City Unified School District (LACUSD) in 1970 to develop the most efficient, effective, and non-redundant means for managing, evaluating, and using instructional materials that would satisfy users of these materials and bring order to the management process. To a greater or lesser extent, all school districts face similar problems in handling of instructional materials. Standardization of practices among districts was considered as an obvious approach to achieving more efficient operations.

The system was to be planned and designed in such a way that it could, with minor alterations, be readily adapted for use in any school district in the United States. The system was to serve both as a model and a prototype of systems for school districts throughout the Nation. There were two phases of the project. Phase I, the study and design phase, was proposed as a one-year effort to identify current practices and needs, specify likely demands of the future, design a system to meet these requirements, and prepare implementation and cost schedules. Phase II was to provide the school district with an operational system.

The AIMS project was funded by the HEA II-B Library Research and Demonstration Program for three years, with some carry-over funds to complete the final report in 1973. Total funding by the U.S. Office of Education amounted to $495,919 over the term of the project, with $62,563 being provided by the sponsoring agency. A subcontract in the amount of $358,658 was awarded to the System Development Corporation (SDC) for technical support. Ms. Mildred Frary of LACUSD served as Project Director.

Hampered by uncertain and insufficient funding, decentralization of LACUSD and other problems, AIMS' efforts were largely discontinued in 1972, although SDC continued until 1973 to complete its technical reports. The end-products of AIMS include an overall systems design and computer programs capable of supporting LACUSD materials ordering and some accounting operations.

This report summarizes the findings of a site visit to LACUSD, describing the project in detail in section 2 and discussing the perceptions of key project staff about the HEA II-B Library Research and Demonstration Program in section 3.

2: HISTORY OF THE PROJECT

2.1: Background

For a number of years, school districts across the nation have faced increasing difficulties in allocating their available resources among the many and various demands made on them. The management of instructional materials has been a particularly critical problem. As the volume, diversity and potential applications of these materials rises, the demand also rises. Enormous volumes of instructional materials need to be selected, purchased, stored, controlled, distributed, and evaluated. In response to these great increases in the volume and type of materials, and in the demands for them, school districts in Los Angeles had been devoting more and more of their financial and administrative resources to this problem. The Los Angeles Unified School District Central Library was serving 448 elementary schools, 131 secondary schools, 28 adult schools, and 180 private schools. In 1970 the library, the textbook section, the audiovisual section, and the science center in the LACUSD were all evaluating, purchasing, announcing, and distributing book and non-book materials. Other divisions, such as accounting and purchasing, required complex interactions. While both were logical and were statutory requirements, they took time and resources away from the materials. An automated system was to provide relief as far as time constraints were concerned as well as better controls.

2.2: Project Objectives

The primary objectives of the AIMS project were to:

- Conduct a comprehensive analysis of the systems and procedures that were being used by the instructional materials handling services of the Los Angeles City Unified School Districts;
- Assess the needs of the present and potential users of instructional materials; and
- Plan an automated system that will meet the District needs for an integrated, efficient material-handling program.

2.3: Project History

An immediate stimulus to the planning of Project AIMS was a position paper[1/] drafted by Roderick D. McDaniel summarizing the views of participants in a professional seminar convened by the California State Department of Education. Encouraged by this paper, and realizing the seriousness and burdensome nature of instructional materials handling problems, the LACUSD (in 1968) proposed that the U.S. Office of Education finance a one-year pilot study to determine optimum system requirements and improved ways and means of selecting, ordering, and controlling the management of school media. This initial application was not funded, but a subsequent request in 1970 was funded for $171,402 in HEA II-B Library Research and Demonstration funds. It was felt that the problem of Los Angeles as a major city and problems faced by the California State Department of Education were not unique. Other major cities and other State Departments of Education faced the same problems. It was felt that a major city, which by virtue of its size, received sample materials for evaluation at no cost from publishers and producers, already carried a professional responsibility to share the results of that evaluation with other districts.

In 1971, current, and potentially available services were studied to recommend a plan for a system that could provide the

---

[1/] Roderick D. McDaniel, Standardized Cataloging for All Media, A Report of Instructional Materials Cataloging Seminar, San Francisco, January 20-21, 1967, 10p.

services needed or serve as a model for other school districts and great cities. This project was to deal with three major concerns. The first was to keep pace with the current expansion of its instructional materials service requirements by applying computer technology to internal bibliographic and business operations. A second need involved extending the reach and effectiveness of services by taking advantage of the by-products of computerization such as retrieval of subject bibliographies for teachers and students. A third major need was for LACUSD personnel to learn the possibilities and advantages of participation in those libraries and information networks most likely to develop within the next few years. In this regard, it was important for staff to become aware of the input requirements and technical facilities of such networks.

2.4: Methodology

The AIMS project had two distinct phases and was to be completed in three years. Phase I was the systems analysis and design phase. This commenced with an LACUSD/SDC survey and analysis of instructional materials handling practices maintained by about 20 urban school districts located in various states. As a result, the requirements of the students, teachers, audiovisual coordinators, librarians, and others who actually used those materials were defined. The requirements pointed to the need for an integrated instructional materials handling system having three distinct subsystems: selection, order, and control. The system was planned to permit various modules to be introduced in any sequence desired for eliminating altogether or delaying certain parts according to the availability of funds.

Phase II was the systems development and implementation phase. The specific capabilities to be obtained in Phase II were:

- inventory control with on-line query capability that was to be implemented for the textbook operation;
- on-line interactive booking systems for 16mm films;

- all materials ordering programs;
- a program for management of the evaluation file;
- an accounting and budgeting program; and
- a MARC index program to support the evaluation of ordering and cataloging functions.

A major scaling-down of USOE funds to support this phase and several basic procedural modifications to accommodate changes in LACUSD priorities delayed the AIMS work schedule and resulted in the curtailment of several prime tasks. Less than half of the Phase I programs originally proposed for pilot system implementation were completed. Those which were completed accomplished only the basic design of AIMS subsystems, some programming of the ordering subsystem and its accounting component.

2.5: Staffing

The management of Project AIMS on behalf of the LACUSD was a responsibility assigned to Mrs. Mildred Frary who originally conceived and promoted the venture as the Director of District Library Services. In Phase I she devoted approximately one third of her time (in Phase II about 15%). She was assisted by a full-time project coordinator and a part-time clerk. Several professional colleagues also worked on behalf of AIMS on a part-time basis as members of a local planning and guidance staff. Subcontract work carried out by the System Development Corporation was directed by Donald V. Black as Project Director. He was assisted by a team of eight library and computer system specialists and the programming staff resources of SDC.

2.6: Problems

The Project Director reported the uncertainty of funding, inappropriateness of staff, and lack of cooperation from the funding agency to be the major problems faced. Some difficulty was encountered in evaluating progress as well.

Because of the political climate within LACUSD, some problems arose in technical planning and in the changing of objectives to meet LACUSD priorities. When LACUSD was reorganized, responsibilities for AIMS became diffused among several offices. As such, priorities were not clear to the subcontractor, and certain products were required before adequate groundwork could be prepared. This resulted in technical errors. It was felt by the Project Director and other respondents that with closer internal controls and monitoring by USOE, many of the problems encountered might have been avoided.

2.7: Advisory Council

The Planning and Guidance Panel consisting of six members, along with a National Advisory Committee, were to guide the progress and course of this project. In 1972 plans were made to transform the existing external advisory body into a National Steering Committee composed of 19 specialists, each representing a separate State, county-city, or professional organization interested in education and/or the field of educational data processing. This committee was never convened because USOE did not approve funding for Phase III.

2.8: Project Evaluation

During November and December 1973 a series of interviews were conducted by AIMS staff in LACUSD and in other districts. The interviews ascertained the prevailing levels of professional knowledge and interest in AIMS and AIMS-like activities, whether AIMS project results were deemed relevant to current needs, and what had been or was actually being done to improve instructional materials handling by local school districts through the use of automated techniques and systems. A continued interest in AIMS ideas was found. An urgent and continued need was expressed for the implementation of AIMS or similar approaches.

Representatives of very small school districts found AIMS "impractical" because local problems could be handled easily and efficiently by "hand" without depending on automation. Representatives of one large city school district praised the AIMS concept and system designs highly. However, they stated flatly, given the present climate of educational decisionmaking, what was needed most urgently to stimulate an interest in adapting AIMS programs would be completion of thorough and fairly long-term, cost-benefit studies that could prove the subsystems' worth.

2.9: Dissemination

Information regarding this project was primarily disseminated via publication of journal articles and presentation of papers at conferences. Dissemination was carried out whenever an opportunity occurred, from the inception of the project through its end. Most of these activities were carried out by the SDC staff members and the LACUSD project director. Dissemination by the U.S. Office of Education was limited to use of ERIC and some informal communication about the project.

2.10: Relationship With Other Projects

No relationships with other projects were reported by respondents.

2.11: Key Finding/Results

The end-product of the AIMS project was an SDC-designed system for ordering and controlling materials within a large district. Only small segments of this system have ever been implemented.

2.12: Impact/Replication

Because the end-product was never implemented, no assessment of the project's impact could be made by project staff. As far as was known by project staff, no attempts have been made to replicate any portion of the project. The Project Director stated that the documentation for the system was available to anyone wanting it, but no provisions have been made for assistance by project staff in such an effort.

3: IMPACT OF THE HEA II-B LIBRARY RESEARCH AND DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM ON THIS PROJECT

This section summarizes the comments of key AIMS staff members about the role that the HEA II-B Library Research and Demonstration Program and its requirements have played in this project as well as these individuals' recommendations for changes.

3.1: Grant History

AIMS received the major part of its funding from the HEA II-B Library Research and Demonstration Program in the years 1971-1974. The first year, USOE provided AIMS with $171,402 in HEA II-B Library Research and Development Program funds. In the second year USOE provided $234,102, and LACUSD provided an additional $67,000. For the third and fourth years, $37,265 and $12,103, respectively, were provided by the HEA II-B Program. LACUSD submitted four versions of a proposal for further funding in 1972. All were rejected. In 1973, USOE requested a modification to LACUSD's proposal to field test the ordering and accounting subsystem for a contract for $70,000. This was refused by LACUSD, resulting in a virtual collapse of AIMS. Funding in 1973 supported only the completion of the final report. With the exception of small amounts from LACUSD, the grants from the Library Research and Demonstration Component of HEA II-B paid for the entire AIMS effort.

3.2: Monitoring and Technical Assistance

The Project Director reported good relationships with USOE representatives. Frequent contact was maintained with USOE headquarters in Washington, D.C. and the Regional Program Officer. All aspects of the project were discussed with Federal officials and changes were effected as a result of such discussions. Reporting to USOE was rated as being helpful. Technical assistance, when requested was received and was perceived by the Project Director to be helpful, relevant, and timely. Especially helpful were the USOE Program Manager and outside consultants.

3.3: Perceptions of Policy and Recommendations for Changes

The AIMS Project Director felt that the HEA II-B Library Research and Demonstration Program has been able to fund projects that State and local governments have not been able to, but these projects were seen as fulfilling National rather than local needs. She felt that the Library Research and Demonstration Component of HEA II-B has been able to meet its overall program objectives successfully, especially in the areas of new technologies, use of resources, needs assessment, and training.

The Project Director recommended an increase in Program dollars from the current $1 million to $5 million, and favored large grants rather than small ones, with preference given to demonstration projects. The Project Director felt that the HEA II-B Library Research and Demonstration Program would be improved by an increase of funds and by an increase in USOE staff to allow more thorough monitoring. She also felt that USOE should conduct its own needs assessments to enable it to "make more comfortable decisions about dispersal of funds." Regarding the grant award process, she also felt that its strengths and weaknesses resided in the quality of readers selected.

3.4: Summary

There is a need for an AIMS-type project, especially in large school systems because the use of instructional media is increasing rapidly. Systems that are similar, but much smaller in scope, have been set up and are operational. However, there is, as of now, no system available which has a capability to accomplish what AIMS had been projected to achieve--integration of the selection, acquisition, distribution, and evaluation of all types of print and non-print materials. AIMS itself has yet to become a reality. Further, no system like it has been accepted or put to work in Los Angeles or elsewhere.

PART II

LIBRARY SERVICES AND CONSTRUCTION ACT: TITLE III--INTERLIBRARY COOPERATION

CASE STUDIES OF LSCA III IN TEN STATES

Overview

Title III of the Library Services and Construction Act--Interlibrary Cooperation--is the only Federal program which provides funds directly to the States for the purpose of promoting and supporting library cooperation and networking. This Program is administered by the U.S. Office of Education's Office of Libraries and Learning Resources, and provides a basic grant of $40,000 to each State and $10,000 to each of the six territories. Remaining funds are allocated to the States on the basis of population. The State Library Agency in each State is responsible for administering these funds. The funds are used to support or expand Statewide networks and cooperatives, to award grants and contracts to local library cooperatives, and/or to participate in multistate networks. Very often, these funds are combined with State funds and are used to support large-scale projects. The patterns of use and impact which LSCA III exhibits are difficult to quantify easily and this requires that a variety of study methods be utilized.

In order to evaluate the impact of this Program, a survey of all State Library Agencies and projects receiving LSCA III funds during Fiscal Year 1976 was conducted. An integral part of this overall study design included conducting intensive case studies of 10 States. The purposes of conducting these case studies were to: 1) investigate a subset of States in a comprehensive manner in order to develop a greater understanding of LSCA III at the State and project level; and 2) provide information which could be used to validate the results of the survey of State Library Agencies and LSCA III projects. In order to provide the appropriate perspective about these case studies, the following sections provide a more detailed discussion of the case study method used and the structure of case study reports.

Case Study Methodology

The purposes for evaluating LSCA III are to: 1) determine the extent to which the LSCA III sponsored program of categorical grants has accomplished its objectives and impacted the library community; 2) identify those factors contributing to the program's successes and failures; and 3) develop policy alternatives for the future Federal (USOE) role in the development of library cooperation and networking. The use of case studies, as an integral part of a large-scale survey, provides the full range of data needed to fully analyze the Program. Case studies are of particular value in the study of LSCA III because they provide an effective method of understanding the full extent of the impact of LSCA III at the State and local level. It was decided to use persons with a background in the library and information sciences to conduct visits to 10 States and prepare case study reports for use by the evaluators.

The method of selecting the 10 States for case study consisted of a systematic random selection procedure which assured that each State had an equal probability of being chosen. This procedure was used because it ensured that any biases of the evaluators would not affect the selection process. The States selected for case study are shown in Exhibit 2. Once the States were selected, it was then necessary to select one LSCA III project per State for study. In some of the States, this was a relatively straight-forward task because all LSCA III funds were used to support a single project during Fiscal Year 1976. In those States where more than one cooperative or networking project received LSCA III funds, the case study project was selected because it 1) received more of the LSCA III grant than the other projects or 2) provided a cooperative or networking service that was somewhat unique or innovative. For LSCA III projects that were selected, nine member or participating libraries were then chosen with the cooperation of either the State Librarian or the LSCA III Project Director. In all instances, the member libraries represented all types of libraries, e.g., public, academic, special, and school. Also, if a networking project's membership did not include all libraries in the service area, as many as eight non-member libraries were also visited.

EXHIBIT 2: STATES SELECTED FOR CASE STUDY OF LSCA III AT THE STATE AND PROJECT LEVEL

	State	Project Name	LSCA III Funding in Fiscal Year 1976	Other Funds Received in Fiscal Year 1976	Total Funding
1.	Alaska	Network Resource Sharing-Health Sciences Project	$41,790	$ 41,790	$ 83,580
2.	California	Cooperative Information Network (CIN)	15,000	271,399	286,399
3.	Minnesota	Minnesota Interlibrary Telecommunications Exhange (MINITEX)	48,664	461,070	509,734
4.	Mississippi	Statewide Telephone and Teletype Reference Service	45,160	165,118	210,278
5.	New Hampshire	New Hampshire Statewide Teletype Network	6,051	14,200	20,251
6.	New York	New York Interlibrary Loan Program (NYSILL)	79,000	284,307	363,307
7.	North Dakota	North Dakota Network for Knowledge	41,414	14,514	55,928
8.	Rhode Island	Statewide Processing Center	42,000	59,000[1]	101,000
9.	Texas[2]	1) Inter University Council of North Texas Microfilm Catalog Project 2) Statewide Publicity Program for Texas Major Resources Systems 3) Membership in the SWLA/CELS Project[3]	61,344	3,791,613	3,852,952
10.	Virginia	Virginia Interlibrary Communication	18,235	14,009	32,244

---

[1] This figure does not include income derived from processing and NELINET membership fees.

[2] The Texas State Library Agency maintains that these 3 activities constitute a single project. Other funds used to support LSCA III projects probably represent the State Library Agencies total annual budget.

[3] South West Library Association's Continuing Education for Librarians

The case studies of each State are based on data collected in interviews with the State Librarian, the LSCA III Coordinator or a comparable planner/administrator at the State Library Agency, the LSCA III Project Director and key technical staff, and directors of participating and nonparticipating libraries. The researcher used questionnaires developed specifically for the case studies. In addition the various mail survey forms were reviewed to provide information on the reliability of survey results. Each case study site visit lasted approximately ten days beginning at the State Library Agency and ending with visits to the participating and nonparticipating libraries. With few exceptions, each of the estimated 200 persons interviewed during the site visits was candid and helpful. The results of the site visits were reviewed and written up in report form and are presented here in Part 2 of this volume of the Final Report.

Structure of the Case Studies

The case studies of LSCA III are divided into 13 sections. Each of these sections (listed at the end of this discussion) present factual data as well as the opinions and judgments of persons interviewed at the State, project and library levels. Because the administrative and operational structures of LSCA III are similar across States, it is possible to examine a particular issue (e.g., management of LSCA III at the State level) for all of the States. The format of the case studies is shown in the following outline:

1. INTRODUCTION: This section presents a brief overview of the status of library development in the State and factors which impact that development.
2. MANAGEMENT OF LSCA III AT THE STATE LEVEL: This section describes and analyzes the various aspects of State Library Agency management of LSCA III. Topics addressed include: needs assessment, defining LSCA III objectives and priorities, policymaking, role of the State Advisory Council and State Library Agency personnel, allocation of LSCA III funds, budgetary controls, and evaluation.

3. IMPACT AND USE OF FEDERAL AND STATE REQUIREMENTS AND CONTROLS ON LSCA III ACTIVITIES: In this section, the various LSCA III requirements such as Long Range Plans and Annual Reports are examined, as are any special State requirements which impact LSCA III.

4. USE OF LSCA III FUNDS BY THE STATE LIBRARY AGENCY: This section examines how LSCA III funds have been used in the State and covers: types of projects funded, products and services resulting from LSCA III, adequacy of funding, use of LSCA III funds to join existing networks, and use of non-LSCA III funds for multitype library cooperation.

5. STATE MEMBERSHIP IN INTERSTATE COMPACTS AND MULTISTATE NETWORKS: The extent of State participation in multistate cooperative activity is reported and analyzed.

6. INTERACTION BETWEEN THE STATE LIBRARY AGENCY AND LSCA III PROJECTS: This section describes how projects not based in the State Library Agency report to the Agency.

7. STATE AND PROJECT LEVEL ASSESSMENT OF LSCA III PROGRAM MANAGEMENT AT THE FEDERAL LEVEL: This section presents assessments of technical assistance, project monitoring and dissemination at the Federal and Regional levels.

8. THE FEDERAL FUNDING FORMULA: Assessments of possible future requirements for State matching versus non-matching of LSCA III funds, and the impact of increased Federal funds are presented here.

9. IMPACT OF LSCA III ON THE STATE: This section presents information on the importance of LSCA III in developing interlibrary cooperation and networking projects, achievements of LSCA III in the State, and the impact of short range funding.

10. STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES OF THE LSCA III PROGRAM: A cross-section of opinions, assessments, and judgements as to LSCA III's positive and negative aspects are presented.

11. FUTURE DIRECTIONS FOR USOE: This section addresses the issue of what the library community would like to change in terms of interlibrary cooperation and networking *vis-a-vis* the Federal role.

12. A DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF AN LSCA III PROJECT: This section covers the services offered by the project, its funding sources, interaction with the State Library Agency, staffing, role of the project advisory panel, problems, evaluation, impact, and role of the project in the State's cooperative and networking efforts.

13. EVALUATION AND CONCLUSIONS: This section presents the researcher's evaluative impressions of LSCA III in the State.

INTERLIBRARY COOPERATION AND NETWORKING: A CASE STUDY OF LSCA III AT THE STATE AND PROJECT LEVEL

State Visited:	Alaska
LSCA III Project Visited:	Network Resource Sharing-Health Sciences Library Project
Period Studied:	Fiscal Year 1976

1: INTRODUCTION

Alaska has the largest area of all the United States and the second smallest population. Mention of isolated locations and isolated libraries is generally more common in Alaska than it is in other States. Half of the State's population lives in and around Anchorage alone. The remainder of the State is essentially rural or uninhabited and within recent years political tension between the urban and rural areas has become more intense. The library field has been affected by this tension. The back country feels the need for basic library facilities and services, and often keeping a library open during the winter is difficult because patrons have difficulty getting to the library and because heating costs are very high. In urban areas such as Anchorage, basic library services are provided, and the more sophisticated patrons demand more extensive resources.

The State government has a history of strong support for libraries and for interlibrary cooperation. The feeling is that recently available funds can be used to take advantage of technological advances which have proven valuable. It is possible to base library services and programs on technological advances and not simply to add these advances to existing library systems, which is the case in many States where service delivery is already rigidly defined.

In keeping with the 1969 State basic plan for library services, the State has been divided into three regions with one library in each designated as the regional resource library. The State Library Agency (Juneau) is the resource center for the south central region, Anchorage is the resource center for the western region, and Fairbanks North Star Borough acts as the third resource center. Fairbanks and Anchorage each have a regional coordinator supported by the State Library Agency who is responsible for coordinating services to the smaller libraries in the region. There is no charge for participation in the State network of libraries. Members are eligible to receive any of the services that are provided. The only cost involved is in the staff time used to participate in the services or utilization of facilities.

Cooperation is an important aspect of library service in Alaska. This site profile presents the results of an intensive series of visits to Alaskan libraries and interviews with State Library Agency personnel. As part of this study of cooperative library activity, one project receiving LSCA III funds in Fiscal Year 1976, the Network Resource Sharing-Health Sciences Library Project, was selected for closer study.

2: MANAGEMENT OF LSCA III AT THE STATE LEVEL

All management of LSCA III is done by the State Librarian and Assistant State Librarian. The Assistant State Librarian serves as the Project Director, and together with the State Librarian acts as the LSCA Coordinator. The long-range plan for library services is specific and represents programmatic implementations of components of the basic plan. Objectives and priorities outlined in the long-range plans are developed by the State Library Agency with more additional input from the Advisory Council. This input from the Advisory Council is informal.

The long-range plan discusses the following topics: materials, personnel, facilities, services, and management. Within each topic are outlined: the need, elements, goal, objective, specific tasks for the next five year period, expected outcomes, and possible tasks for the next five year period.

In allocating LSCA III funds specific tasks are identified based on the long-range plan and are then funded. Often the LSCA III funds are used to supplement State funds.

Budget preparation and controls are handled by the State Librarian and Assistant State Librarian. The State Librarian plans to make greater use of the Advisory Council for this purpose, and specifically feels that it is easy for the Council at this time to express their positive feelings about projects which should be funded. When the Council is directly involved in the ranking of projects and, further, in deciding the actual level of funding for each project, the Council's input will be more substantial.

2.1: Needs Assessment

According to the State Librarian formal needs assessments are regularly conducted. The latest was in July 1977. The most useful methods for determining needs are soliciting comments from the field and conducting needs surveys. The next most useful method is collecting input from the State Advisory Council. There is also a constant process of matching needs with those identified in the State's long-range plans for library development. The results of these needs assessments are used very extensively for developing and modifying objectives, providing documentation to support decisions, determining criteria for project selection, and determining funding allocations. The results of the needs assessments are incorporated by the Assistant State Librarian when writing the long-range plans.

2.2: Defining LSCA III Objectives and Priorities

The State Librarian feels that the State's library objectives match perfectly with the objectives of the Federal LSCA III program. As described by the State Librarian, the role of LSCA III is seen as "percolating through" the State's Five-Year Plan. The following documents are all considered very useful in setting objectives for LSCA III projects: State long-range programs, LSCA regulations plans for interlibrary cooperation/networking, and results of needs assessment. The single most important factor influencing the decision to change LSCA III objectives is given as availability of other funding for "specifics." If, for instance, resources are available to develop facilities, priorities for LSCA III funding of personnel may be postponed and the funding diverted to supplementing development of facilities.

The key document underlying Alaskan library services is Library Service for all Alaskans: A Statewide Development Plan, published by librarians throughout the State. Additionally, each year, a long-range program for a projected five-year period is written by the Assistant Librarian. Sometimes there was confusion between these plans when discussion of plans was brought up at libraries.

The State has a general Advisory Council which meets to discuss all aspects of State library programming. This Council fills the requirements of LSCA, and it participates in all previously mentioned aspects of the policymaking process except in allocating LSCA III resources.

2.3: Policymaking Relative to LSCA III

The State Librarian and the State Library Planning Staff participate in all the following aspects of the policymaking process: assessing needs, setting priorities, setting objectives, and determining criteria for allocating LSCA III resources.

2.4: The Role of the LSCA Advisory Council and State Library Agency in LSCA III

It is the feeling at the State Library Agency that the Advisory Council has been highly significant in advising the development of the State Plan.

The Advisory Council, which meets two or three times a year, discusses the directions in which the State Library Agency should move. The Council produces guidelines but does not participate in particular workshops or activities. The exact administrative function of determining the source which shall fund specific activities and to what extent is left to the State Library Agency. The

Governor is particularly interested in giving input into policy decisions in the State, and the Advisory Council has been bolstered by his expressed feeling.

The State Librarian hopes to involve the Advisory Council in deciding the actual budget levels of LSCA III projects because decisions at the budgetary level will increase the degree of involvement of the Council which is now limited to making general recommendations.

Of State Library Agency personnel who work on the project, nearly 100 percent of the Assistant State Librarian's time is spent on interlibrary and cooperative activities with about 3 percent of this time on the LSCA III Project. Approximately 40 percent of the State Librarian's time is spent on interlibrary and cooperative activities with about 2 percent of this on the LSCA III Project.

2.5: Allocation of LSCA III Funds

The following methods of allocating LSCA III funds are used: 1) soliciting proposals informally from specific individuals or institutions for specific projects, 2) distributing funds to libraries in accordance with plans for a statewide network, and 3) distributing funds in accordance with a program developed at the State level (excluding Statewide networks). All of these methods are considered somewhat less than very useful. Another method, considered less useful than the others but also used, is formally soliciting proposals from the field (including requests for proposals).

When reviewing the proposals requesting funding under LSCA III, the following review criteria set by the State Library Agency are considered to be very useful: relationship to the long-range program for library development, adequacy of personnel and facilities, capability of integrating funded activities into a permanent program of services, adequacy of support by local funds, and degree to which project addresses high priority needs. The potential success of a project in attracting other (non-LSCA III) funds is a review criterion which is not used as it is considered relatively useless.

2.6: Budget and Preparation and Control

In Alaska the State Librarian and the Assistant State Librarian are involved in the preparation of the budget for LSCA III projects. For all funding sources the State plans only for the current year because money is not obligated until it has been approved. The State Librarian feels it is realistic not to encumber funds until they have been authorized/appropriated. However, there is a commitment to seeking funds on a long-range basis. Funding for the LSCA III projects is provided using funds forwarded or carried over from the previous year. This year for the first time the State Librarian is now able to do the same with LSCA I funds.

The State Librarian believes that the mechanism by which the budget is prepared is adequate. It is a relatively small amount of money so there is less planning than is required for other projects involving more money, and LSCA III projects are relatively well-defined and identifiable. The State Librarian has final authority to approve the budget for LSCA III projects. The budget is reviewed by the Division of Budget and Management (the fiscal component) of the Department of Education (the State Library Agency is part of the Department of Education). Also the Governor and/or legislature may review the budget but do so without specific project details.

2.7: Evaluation of LSCA III Projects by the State Library Agency

Methods used to evaluate LSCA III projects include formal surveys of users and informal feedback from library personnel and library users. These evaluations are usually conducted on a yearly basis by the State Library Agency and its staff.

Continuing education projects receiving LSCA III support are evaluated using a mail survey of participants. State Library staff also evaluate the types of requests received by the State Library

Interlibrary Loan Section. Also, evaluation forms are collected at workshops. When asked specifically about the two projects which received LSCA III funds in Fiscal Year 1976, it was learned that a formal survey of the users was conducted by the Health Sciences Library and was very useful to the Health Sciences Library and to the State Library Agency.

3: IMPACT AND USE OF FEDERAL AND STATE REQUIREMENTS AND CONTROLS ON LSCA III ACTIVITIES

Each of the LSCA III requirements and controls was evaluated by the State Librarian and Assistant State Librarian, and comments on how the requirements could be made more useful were also provided.

The Five-Year State Program was rated as a very useful concept, and there were no suggestions for improving it. The Annual Program was viewed as relatively useless. The required program categories are not useful. Certain of the terms such as bookmobile books are viewed as archaic and not useful. Also, the long-range program requested information which required much work, and the annual plan asks for this same information. The annual plan is growing less useful because the State is getting no feedback. There are numerous reporting forms going out, but there is little feedback on them. In short, the Annual Plan is viewed as an end itself and not a means.

Project reports were not felt to be useful, though it was noted that perhaps they are not done as well as they should be. The emphasis placed on needs assessment is very useful. "It would be helpful if needs assessment could be done by another agency not involved in LSCA III funding." The emphasis placed on evaluation is also very useful. However, it was felt that USOE is not really involved in this, and libraries are looking for help in this area. Also, fiscal oversight agencies are looking for information and results in projects. Often these agencies get negative impact information. It is thought that USOE should set up a model or standard of measurement.

With regard to the State Advisory Council, it was thought that the individual members are very good. However, regular meetings are very expensive because of travel costs, and it is difficult for the Council to continue to keep themselves informed with only two or three meetings a year. If money were available, two councils would be desired--one consisting of lay persons and one of professionals. Alaska has experimented with this to offset the fact that the lay persons tend to defer to librarians.

Regarding the support by the State Legislature, the State Librarian feels that they have given him the authority to work with all types of libraries, and that they have been very supportive of all the goals of LSCA III. The State Legislature does not monitor specific LSCA III projects, but they have funded library cooperative activities.

In 1976, State legislation was passed which required the State Library Agency to increase interlibrary cooperation. The State has since requested information to determine if this has taken place.

4: USE OF LSCA III FUNDS BY THE STATE LIBRARY AGENCY

4.1: Types and Numbers of LSCA III Projects Funded

The State Library generally contributes LSCA III funds toward two or three projects per year. At first the money went into planning activities such as developing a basic statewide library plan or bringing the Advisory Council together for planning purposes. More recently it has gone into contributing to the statewide network by providing training, continuing education, developing a particular product, and/or establishing a particular link in the network. The funds have been used primarily for salaries and contractual services. There is no particular trend toward funding larger or smaller projects. The following table presents a summary of LSCA III projects funded from 1969-1976.

LSCA III PROJECTS FOR THE STATE OF ALASKA

YEAR	TITLE OF PROJECT	ADMINISTERING AGENCY	SOURCE OF FUNDS				USE		
			LSCA III	STATE	LOCAL	OTHER	SALARIES	EQUIPMENT	OTHER
1969	1. Administrative Planning Activities for Inter-Library Cooperation	Alaska State Library Agency	$ 1,799	$ 1,799					$ 3,598
1970	1. Administrative Planning Activities for Inter-Library Cooperation	(as above)	3,216	3,217			$ 5,659		416 (contractual) 358
	2. Developing Staff Resources	(as above)	1,610	1,816					3,426
	3. Book Cataloging and Processing Center	(as above)	4,991		$ 6,000		6,000		4,991 (contractual)
1971	1. Administrative Planning	(as above)	6,792	1,412			6,819		262 (contractual) 1,123
	2. Processing Center	Greater Anchorage Area School District	9,380	9,380			10,094	$ 2,572	2,163 (contractual) 1,931
	3. Telex-Communication Network	University of Alaska	8,760	14,140			13,340		8,760 (contractual) 800
	4. Administration - Inter-Library Cooperation	Alaska State Library Agency	2,062	2,063			4,000		125
1972	1. Development of Regional Network System	(as above)	5,763	6,078			7,264		2,198 (contractual) 2,380
	2. Expansion of Telex and Continuing Education (WICHE)	University of Alaska Library	15,000	17,367			17,367		14,550 (contractual) 500
	3. Alaskana Resource Library	Alaska State Library	20,000						20,000 (contractual)
1973	1. Expansion of Telex/ Resources Directory	University of Alaska Library	20,622						20,622 (contractual)
	2. Continuing Education and Training (WICHE)	Alaska State Library	27,263				16,377	1,413	9,473
	3. Expansion of Telex	University of Alaska Library	13,500						13,500 (contractual)
1974	1. Continuing Education	Alaska State Library	6,511						6,511 (contractual)
	2. Improve Access to Information Resources	University of Alaska and Alaska State Library	34,197	2,345			23,713		4,200 (contractual) 8,629
1975	1. Continuing Education	Alaska State Library	7,278						7,278 (contractual)
1976	1. Continuing Education	(as above)	14,722						13,422 (contractual)
	2. Expansion of Regional Network/Resource Sharing	(as above)	11,334	54,425			55,404		10,355

As previously mentioned two projects received funding in fiscal year 1976. The Network Resource Sharing-Health Sciences Library Project received $27,314 in LSCA III funds and $41,790 in State funds.[1] The Network Continuing Education project received $13,422 in LSCA III funds. Both projects also received funds during the Transitional Quarter of 1976.

4.2: Products and Services Resulting from Availability of LSCA III Funds

Eight telex machines have been installed in libraries throughout the State. Also, two special studies have been completed. The first study resulted in the State's basic library plan entitled *Library Service for all Alaskans: A Statewide Development Plan*. The second resulted in a two volume report: *The Alaska Library Network: Resource Directory Alaskana Project*.

LSCA III funds have also been invested in the development of a book cataloging and processing center at the State Library Agency. This service is used most heavily by small libraries in the State. One set of cards is maintained at the State Library Agency for each item processed. This project is intended to become a union catalog for the State.

While it may not be strictly considered a product by definition, a great deal of LSCA III funds have been invested in the education of librarians. The 1976 Network Continuing Education project used LSCA III funds to sponsor two conferences and five workshops. Every library which was visited was aware of the procedures for interlibrary loan. Regardless of whether or not libraries acquiring materials are heavy users or light users, they always knew immediately where further resources could be accesssed. For example, in an Eskimo village of 225 residents where the library consisted of four cardboard boxes of books kept under a bed, the volunteer librarian knew that other materials could be acquired through interlibrary loan procedures and was prepared to fill requests.

---

[1] The amounts shown here are correct. The funding date shown in the table is derived from estimates of projected use of LSCA III submitted to USOE in 1975.

4.3: Adequacy and Ratios of Funding Sources

The State Librarian feels that State and local funding for networking and cooperative projects in the State has been adequate, but the Federal level has been very inadequate compared to the role it should have. Specifically, total funding support during Fiscal Year 1976 for LSCA III projects was inadequate. Alaskan objectives are set in terms of the funds available to them, but they could be expanded if more money were available.

Concerning the Network Resource Sharing-Alaska Health Sciences Library project, the Assistant State Librarian said it would be possible to spend just State funds on the project. The project is so reflective of library cooperation and the essence of LSCA III that a significant amount of Federal money should be and is spent on the project. There is some feeling that this State is letting the Federal LSCA III program receive good publicity by investing its resources in high visibility projects which are predominantly financed with State funds.

4.4: Use of LSCA III Funds to Join Existing Cooperatives and Networks

The State Librarian feels that using LSCA III funds to join existing cooperatives and networks is an effective use of the funds and that the availability of Federal funds acts as an incentive for joining existing cooperatives.

Indeed, the Network Resource Sharing-Health Sciences Library project may indirectly be seen as using LSCA III funds to join existing cooperatives. The State Librarian, when talking about the project, mentioned that it would provide better access to other subject fields and data bases. The Assistant State Librarian indicated that it would be desirable to make the medical library network available to the general public.

The Health Sciences Library using the Federal Telecommunications System can access the regional Pacific Northwest Health Sciences Library at the University of Washington in Seattle and through them the National Medical Library in Bethesda. MEDLINE searches are performed regularly. The State Library Agency is a member of the Washington Library Network and uses the Pacific Northwest Bibliographic Center.

4.5: Use of Other Funds for Interlibrary Cooperatives

Alaska uses $80,500 of LSCA I funds and $625,666 of State funds for a library services and extension project which partially conforms with the LSCA III emphasis on interlibrary cooperation. Two other projects also partially conform to LSCA III. One is a processing center funded by the State for $77,000. The second project is a library development program which received $90,000 of LSCA I funds and $74,700 in State funds. The State Librarian listed no projects which were begun with LSCA III funds which continued with other support funds. Also, no LSCA III project has been seriously restricted because of the unavailability of funds.

5: STATE MEMBERSHIP IN INTERSTATE COMPACTS AND MULTISTATE NETWORKS

Alaska is very much involved in interstate compacts and multistate networks. They are also involved with information exchange on an international level. Washington State is the focus of much of the cooperative efforts outside Alaska because they are the closest State and because they also have had and still do have an interest in cooperative situations.

Alaskan librarians were participants in the formation of the Washington Library Network (WLN) and contributed comments at goal setting meetings. Presently Alaska is the only State which is a member of this network. The States of Idaho and Montana have expressed an interest in joining the network but they require more specific information regarding their own commitments and the benefits of membership before they can agree to any formal contracts. Because Alaska has a greater need and desire to join the network, they have accepted a rather flexible contract with WLN. The cost for membership for the State of Alaska will consist of a base membership for the first year of $30,000. In addition to this there will be specific charges for different types of services which Alaska may elect to receive. For the base fee WLN will provide two terminals to the Alaska State Library Agency.

Interlibrary loan requests from people in Alaska through their local library are directed through the State Library to the Pacific Northwest Bibliographic Center (PNBC). Large resource libraries in Alaska can contact PNBC directly. In the past, the charge for the service to the State has been $20,000 per year. In addition to this, the University of Alaska at Fairbanks makes a $1,000 yearly donation to PNBC. The formula which serves as the basis of charges has been changed somewhat, and will result in an increase in the fees paid by Alaska. The anticipated rate for next year is $27,000. The State Librarian, while not objecting to the amount, does not want to see the formula based entirely on the level of usage by a member of PNBC, and feels that this method of computing charges may encourage libraries to pass the costs to the ultimate patron user. He thought this would set a poor precedent. Information should be passed on to patrons with the costs absorbed by some other level. This is a commonly debated question in the library/information science profession, "Who should pay for information received?" Presently, 98 percent of the PNBC resources are directed to serving Alaskans, although the total population of Alaska accounts for only 4 percent of the population served by PNBC.

A stated task for 1975-76 in the long-range plan for 1975-80 is to continue to participate in the Western Interlibrary Network (WIBNET), although it is the feeling of the Assistant State Librarian that this network may never actually have existed. The Assistant State Librarian said "It has only been a network on paper." However, the State Library Agency does have access to the Lockheed DIALOG data base and to the San Mateo Educational Research Center (CSMERC) in California.

Although not specifically a network, further resources which are used by the State Library Agency and which provide information supplied by many sources, are the specialized information services with microfiche data bases such as Congressional Information Service, the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC), and the American Statistics Index.

As will be mentioned in Section 12, the Health Sciences Library has available to it medical information resources on a national level. And through the link with the Alaska State Library Network these resources are available to all libraries in the State.

Other libraries in the State participate in larger networks which are not directly related to the State Library Agency networking efforts. The Auke Bay Fisheries Research Laboratory Library is administratively under the United States Department of Commerce, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) Environmental Data Service, Library and Information Services Division, Environmental Science Information Center. A book catalog and shelf list of materials in the Library and Information Services Division are available. NOAA has compiled a union list of serials with the United States Environmental Protection Agency and the United States Patent and Trademark Office. The Auke Bay Fisheries Research Laboratory Library Director has compiled a union list of periodicals which includes holdings of his library, the Northwest Fisheries Center, Seattle, and the Northwest Fisheries Center Marine Mammals Division.

General reference questions are referred to the State Library Agency. Specific requests are referred to the National Marine Fisheries Laboratory in Washington. Other Federal department libraries appear to have similar information resource hierarchies. The exception seems to be direct formal relationships between or among the different Federal departments. In Juneau there is some desire to establish a natural resources library. This would involve the merging of collections from three Federal libraries in the area representing the Department of Agriculture--Forest Service, the Department of Interior--Bureau of Mines, and the Department of Commerce--NOAA.

It is in the government documents field where the State Library Agency takes on an international information exchange perspective. The State Library Agency has a selective Canadian documents collection, and Canada has a selective Alaska documents collection in Ottawa. There is also an exchange of documents with Yukon Territory. There are also frequent joint library meetings.

The State Library Agency is the distribution center for State documents. They receive 20 copies of all State documents which are distributed to 13 libraries in Alaska. Three of these libraries are temporarily maintaining the collections until other libraries in the State are developed to the point of being able to accept State documents collections. Thirteen copies of State documents are distributed to libraries outside Alaska. These include: Washington State Library, Olympia; California State Library, Sacramento; Center for Research Libraries, Chicago; National Library of Canada; Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.; University of Washington Library, Seattle; and the Seattle Public Library.

6: INTERACTION BETWEEN THE STATE LIBRARY AGENCY AND LSCA III PROJECTS

LSCA III projects in Alaska are managed by State Library Agency personnel, and interaction between the various actors is an ongoing intraoffice process.

7: STATE AND PROJECT LEVEL ASSESSMENT OF LSCA III PROGRAM MANAGEMENT AT THE FEDERAL LEVEL

7.1: Technical Assistance

The USOE Regional Program Officer (RPO) is contacted regularly at regional library meetings in Washington State. The RPO also visits Alaska occasionally. The State Library Agency is satisfied with the assistance received from this level. The RPO is also involved in assessing needs and determining criteria for allocating LSCA III resources.

7.2: Monitoring of Projects

The State Librarian feels that the review and feedback on written reports and the project management review which was conducted last year were very useful. Feedback on reports took the form of technical clarification rather than content. Citations from the literature passed on to projects by the RPO were relatively less valuable.

7.3: Dissemination of Information and Materials

USOE has not disseminated information about this project specifically, however Alaska's usage of satellite technology has been disseminated, and the State Librarian reports that Alaska has received a number of inquiries about this activity. Also the State Librarian has received information on other cooperative projects from the RPO.

8: THE FEDERAL FUNDING FORMULA

8.1: Matching Versus Nonmatching of State and Federal Funds

The State Librarian is satisfied that LSCA III funds are distributed on a nonmatching basis, because it is appropriate to the concept of reaching beyond immediate clientele which State, local, and LSCA I funding tend to address.

8.2: Impact of Increased Federal LSCA III Funds

The State Librarian would like to see an increase in the basic amount of LSCA III funds by 200 percent. If funds were increased, they would be used for "better coordination of school libraries and independent libraries." Also, increased funding would benefit activities similar to those currently funded, would accelerate the current program in order to achieve its objectives more quickly, would be used to reach more libraries with existing services, and would provide for more TWX terminals and for more computer terminals.

The State Librarian expressed the hope that increased Federal funding would not require increased regulations, and feels that "laws leave more leeway than regulations." Intent should be the key, and regulations should be sufficiently open to allow for interpretation and experimentation. "Regulations often become excessively confining through re-interpretation. There should be allowance for resource and regional differences. Due to extreme needs in Alaska we need more flexibility."

9: IMPACT OF LSCA III ON THE STATE

9.1: Development of LSCA III Type Projects Without Federal Funding

The State Librarian feels that development of LSCA III type projects would have been less extensive without Federal funding. "There are cooperative projects now without or with little State or Federal money." Alaskans are anxious to work together to gain resources. For instance, the Kenai Peninsula has a joint public relations program. Many people feel the library does not meet their needs and to improve service they will support strong cooperation efforts. LSCA III stimulates this. Telex was initiated with LSCA III funds. After proving it worked, the libraries they were located in picked up the bills for their use.

It is important to remember that there are only about 200 librarians in the Alaska Library Association. As the director of the Anchorage Public Library said, "We may not all like each other but we all know each other." There were questions at the member libraries about whether a program which had been presented (particularly continuing education workshops) was sponsored by the State Library Agency for the Alaska Library Association. This question arises because programs have a relatively small number of people and resources to draw upon. Also, for the convenience of people who may be traveling great distances, State Library Agency programs are often presented in conjunction with Alaska Library Association meetings.

Another result of the relatively small number of library professionals within the State is that there is a great deal of informal interaction. Expedient methods to reach ends which do not depend on formal agreements of parent companies or governmental bureaucracies are common. For example, use of another library's National Union Catalog to complete cataloging is common.

The actual delivery of books and non-book materials seemed to be a much larger problem than interlibrary communication. Mail delivery is frequently used and just as frequently criticized.

9.2: Achievement of LSCA III Projects in the State

According to the State Librarian, "We hoped the projects would tie us together. Support for interaction has evolved in all types of libraries. LSCA III is actually a small amount of total funding, but LSCA III gives additional stimulus. The University of Alaska has a union list of periodicals, but without LSCA III funds they could not have continued its development. Guidelines were pretty well set and money has been distributed as it came in. Larger amounts of Federal money would allow greater access."

9.3: Predictability of Funding and Its Impact on Cooperatives

The State Librarian feels he would be much more willing to put money into hardware and startup costs, if the Federal funds were more predictable. Plans tend to go much slower, more tentatively when it is not known when funds will be provided and how much funding will be received.

When asked how far ahead he can realistically plan for use of funds from different sources for library projects, the State Librarian explained that they assume that State funds will not be cut. Federal funds are the next surest source, while local funds are least predictable. There are more restrictions placed on local funds. If, for example, two members of a library board change, the availability of local funds may also be affected.

10: STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES OF THE LSCA PROGRAM

The State Librarian feels that the strengths of the LSCA III Program are that it is applicable to the many needs of all kinds of libraries and does not emphasize one type of patron over another. Also, LSCA III does not require matching by the State and permits a wide variety of activities. The weaknesses are the lack of funds and that funds cannot be spent for materials. If these weaknesses were somehow eliminated, the funds might produce stronger results.

Many of the librarians visited in this study were outspoken in their support for interlibrary cooperation and networking.

Librarians at the University of Alaska in Anchorage observed that interlibrary relationships are becoming more formal, and printed catalogs of holdings of the State network which could be passed around the State would be beneficial. The Library Director observed that they have traditionally looked to the State Library Agency for assistance in cooperative matters but perhaps this should be a Federal role. This library, which serves a relatively large number of walk-in non-student patrons, does not see itself as an active network participant. But for non-print materials, the library engages in much more active cooperative efforts.

A school librarian who depends on the State Library Agency for audiovisual materials views booking of materials as a real problem and suggested that a better booking system should be coordinated so that if available, films are distributed quickly to all. A computerized Statewide system would be an excellent expenditure of LSCA III funds.

Concerning the cataloging which is done for the library by the State Library Agency, one local librarian said that she "could produce the cards" if they could more rapidly communicate (perhaps via teletype or telephone) the contents of the cataloging. The librarian observed that without the Statewide network the Nome Public Library would not have many resources.

The public relations aspect of networking was noted by the North Star Borough Public Library in Fairbanks which acts as a resource center. Often people in outlying areas are more aware of library services than are local persons. Also, the regional librarian sees the strain on large libraries participating in the network as being a strain on staff rather than on collections.

With regard to future Federal directions in cooperatives, Anchorage librarians stated that "it takes more than an individual State. We need a national commitment, and the commitment of the Federal government for research has been minimal. A great deal of money would be saved if all libraries were engaged in cooperative activities. Duplication of efforts would be lessened and library users would have a clearer view of library services. If Federal control were the price required, it would not necessarily be bad."

Another academic librarian reported that if use of LSCA III funds in Alaska is indicative, more Federal funding is needed and the State Library Agency needs more discretion.

11: FUTURE DIRECTIONS FOR USOE

The State Librarian feels that equality of access should be the goal not equality of collections, and would rather see more money in LSCA III than in LSCA I. There is no fear of the implications of a larger percentage of library cooperative money coming from the Federal level except that regulations might become confining. USOE should allow the States to comply with the intent of the law and should leave an opening for interpretation and experimentation. Regulations are often too confining due to the variety of interpretations they undergo. In the future USOE needs to allow for differences in resources as well as regional variations.

Alaska would like standards for evaluation to be developed by USOE. Also, there is a greater need to tie in continuing education with interlibrary cooperation and evaluation methods. USOE should examine the library education institutes; while they are supposed to be applicable to all States, they are never applicable to the particular needs of a State. Each State is developing its own programs from scratch, and these programs are applicable to needs in other States. But, help is needed in "transplanting." The key may be in more national institutes and workshops.

For the overall development of interlibrary cooperation and networking in the State, the State Librarian feels that the Federal government share of funding should be increased. The proportion of the total funding the Federal government should undertake is 50 percent. "If on the basis that it is not just a State project, it could be regional or national, what is needed is a mechanism to fund on a regional level. Fifty percent should be the national share of all cooperating." Continuing, the State Librarian stated that the State government share of funding should be decreased. The State government should undertake 30 percent of the total funding. "It is now paying more than its share." Of course the "actual money should be increased, just the percent should be decreased." The local government share of funding should be increased. The local level should undertake 20 percent of the total funding. "The State Library Agency should be the dispersal unit, as it would encourage cooperation."

There is a need for more Federal direction for cooperative efforts. It was suggested that a portion of LSCA III or some other Federal funds might go to the Library of Congress to explore guidelines for cooperatives and network sharing. The State Library Agency tends to support the Library of Congress for this role because it has the resources, and the current Librarian of Congress is very astute.

The State Librarian believes that because USOE is oriented toward the State and Federal level, it should allow for a regional level funding mechanism. He believes that his State is developing a Statewide library network at a reasonable pace. The next logical step and one which they are pursuing is toward cooperative efforts on a regional basis with other States in the Pacific Northwest. Cooperative efforts will have to be developed at the regional level before a nationwide plan can be implemented. Facilitation of regional interaction is a problem best addressed by the Federal government. Guidelines must be determined for this interaction.

The State Librarian clearly sees the goal of library cooperation as equality of access not equality of collection. When Federal money is given to augment collections, there should be a stipulation that the materials be accessible to others through cooperation.

There is a great deal of consistency on several topics in Alaska. This may be due to any or all of the following. The State is geographically isolated from the rest of the nation. Relatively different and more difficult natural conditions exist. The professional community is small in size. The State has recently experienced dramatic changes in population and income. Whatever the reasons, there is a consensus on the need for library cooperation. No one that was interviewed felt that resources of large participating libraries in cooperatives were strained. No one saw a possibility of having to pick up LSCA III funded projects if Federal funds were discontinued because all felt the State Library Agency would continue the efforts. Everyone expressed their interest in providing service to whomever could make use of their resources and facilities. At the University of Alaska in Fairbanks the estimate is that 5 to 10 percent of library usage is accounted for by non-students. At the University of Alaska at Anchorage 13 percent of the circulation is to non-students and in fact, the libraries' selection policy is influenced by this. There is more willingness to provide services of an interlibrary nature than direct services to walk-in referral patrons. Private industry libraries and Federal libraries which might seem to have relevance to limited users were no less willing to provide assistance than public libraries.

12: A DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF NETWORK RESOURCE SHARING-HEALTH SCIENCES LIBRARY PROJECT

12.1: Services Offered by the Project

The Network Resource Sharing-Health Sciences Library project was established to link the Health Sciences Library to the Statewide library network. The Health Sciences Library is accessible through telephone, mail, or a telex. It is located at the University of Alaska at Fairbanks library. The Health Libraries in the State have access to extensive medical information resources. Using the Federal Telecommunications System, the Health Sciences Library can access the regional Pacific Northwest Health Sciences Library at the University of Washington in Seattle and through them, the National Medical Library in Bethesda, Maryland. The Health Sciences Library routes interlibrary loans and provides interlibrary reference to members of the statewide network. Responce may take the form of photocopies which are provided at no cost.

During Fiscal Year 1976, the Health Sciences Library received and filled 2,598 reference inquiries and received and filled 67,071 interlibrary loan requests. Telecommunications were used, but data on usage were not kept.

12.2: Federal Sources

The Federal LSCA III contribution to the project in 1976 was $41,790. The State of Alaska contributed $41,790. Of this total the amount which was expended on salaries and wages was $55,404.

Federal control of the Health Sciences Library will be diminished as State support for the library increases. Currently, 43 percent of the support for Health Sciences Library is furnished by the State through the State Library Agency. The State will be assuming the salary for the Health Sciences Library Director during the next fiscal year, and following that the Research Specialist on the staff will also become a State salaried employee.

Fifty-one percent of the support for the Health Sciences Library is Federal. This amounts to about $95,000 yearly and is paid by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Public Health Service. They also receive support from the National Library of Medicine (NLM) through the University of Washington and are eligible to use the NLM library resources. Private contributions are also used in supporting this service. Because of the variety of funding sources, the Health Sciences Library has enjoyed a great deal of independence and autonomy.

Of interest also may be the general budget of the Health Sciences Library. This was available for Fiscal Year 1977 and reflects the increased contribution by the State. The total LSCA III funding amounts to $11,542. Other Federal government funding totals $89,500. The increased State of Alaska funding level amounted to $68,175. Other grants and contracts contributed $8,879 and monetary donations totaled $2,000.

12.3: Interaction with the State Library Agency

As noted earlier, State Library Agency staff are responsible for this project, and it is an integral part of the Agency's functions.

12.4: Project Staffing

The LSCA III project funded three full-time clerical and other support staff and one full-time Library Technical/Paraprofessional in Fiscal Year 1976. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Public Health Service, provided for one full-time librarian and one full-time computer related staff person. The National Library of Medicine funded a full-time clerical position.

12.5: Role of the Project Advisory Council

The Health Sciences Library has an Advisory Committee but the specific LSCA III project does not. The State Librarian is on the Advisory Committee of the Health Sciences Library. This Advisory Committee is reflective of the several health sciences fields.

12.6: Problems

The State Library Agency evaluation of the project indicated that the biggest problem was a difficulty in reaching users. In an effort to solve this, the State has implemented continuing education programs about networking and the services and resources which are available to network participants.

12.7: Evaluation by the LSCA III Project

This project relies most heavily on informal evaluation tools including feedback from users and staff of participating libraries. In addition, the project staff has analyzed cost and dollar usage statistics. Each of these methods has been found to be very useful. These evaluations generally take place on a bimonthly basis.

12.8: Impact

The Network Resource Sharing-Health Sciences Library project has been considered to be such a success at the State Library Agency that the administration believes it would be beneficial on a national scale to provide library networks with access to the medical library network.

The reasons that the State Library Agency saw for the success of the Network Resource Sharing-Health Sciences Library project were the commitment of the staff to do the project, the project was well planned, and it provided needed service.

There is a disparity in the roles the State Library Agency and the other libraries expect for the project and their role vis-a-vis the project. The State Library Agency views the Health Sciences Library as filling a definite need for medical information in the State. Librarians felt they had used the Health Sciences Library resources. Yet at Loussac Public Library in Anchorage, the largest public library in the State with a collection size second only to the Fairbanks Public School, the interlibrary loan division estimate was that ten questions per year were referred to the Health Sciences Library. At the Juneau Public Library there was concern about how to better conduct the reference interview to get the necessary information from patrons who were reluctant to tell about their private medical situation. There was also concern about the phrasing of a specific question to obtain the desired information.

Also, when the Director of the Health Sciences Library described his services to the general public through the State Library Network, they were seen as insignificant in number. The Health Sciences Library has strict rules concerning walk-in, lay use of the facilities. These users are not eligible for circulation privileges or free photocopying. Eligibility for services is limited to health care providers in Alaska. This includes teachers, researchers, practitioners, and students in health sciences. All members of the University of Alaska system are eligible for service because the University provides the library with space. The library has an active program for informing the health community about their services and facilities. They visit hospitals, conventions, conduct Public Health Service Orientations. The success may be measured by the fact that there are 800 subscribers to their Table of Contents Service and 225 on the Selected Dissemination of Information (SSI) data base. The Health Sciences Library staff could see no change in the service they provided after the contact with the State Library Agency.

It was never possible to resolve the differences in the quantity and quality of services the Health Sciences Library saw itself providing to the State Library Agency and State Library Network member libraries and the services these member libraries saw themselves receiving. Everyone was satisfied that all was just as it should be, so perhaps this resolution of differences is not important.

12.9: Role of Project in States' Cooperative and Networking Efforts

According to the State Librarian and Assistant State Librarian, this project complements other State efforts. It "saves us from having to develop medical collections, saves duplication, and is an access point." Member libraries report that they forwarded reference questions and interlibrary loan requests to the Health Sciences Library and received relatively fast, good service. At the Health Sciences Library the opinion was that they had answered relatively few interlibrary loan requests and reference questions from other than the professional health community.

13: EVALUATION AND CONCLUSIONS

Alaska has a strong feeling toward support of library cooperatives and networks. State legislation requires that the State Library Agency be active in the field. The State has resources, and State funds are in effect undermatched by LSCA I and III in the field of library cooperative efforts. They have a master plan for library service which everyone thinks is excellent. The plan calls for building on strengths and development of networks. Long-range plans for five-year periods are revised annually. These are comprehensive and the basis of them is the master plan with added input from the State Library Agency and the State Advisory Committee. Specific projects within the Five-Year Plans are funded as money is available. This State seems to be an excellent example of good planning. Some of this is no doubt due to the excellent communication which is possible when there is a relatively small professional community.

Perhaps there is a desire for cooperation because the large size of the State tends to make people feel isolated. Dissemination of information about interlibrary loan and reference referral throughout the State network seemed to be very good. Libraries were willing to share their own resources. No one felt that large libraries tended to be strained in the network.

LSCA III funds serve as an impetus and supplement to State funds, and the member libraries know about LSCA III supported projects. The only non-users of the State network seemed to be new librarians who did not know about it yet.

Telecommunications, network links outside the State and continuing education are the particular concerns at the present for the State Library. Perhaps they are able to look outside of the State for Federal direction in cooperation because they have already achieved most of their goals within the State. The State Network seems to already include all of the major resource centers. Communication lines have been established between the smallest libraries and the resource network.

INTERLIBRARY COOPERATION AND NETWORKING: A CASE STUDY OF LSCA III AT THE STATE AND PROJECT LEVEL

State Visited: California

LSCA III Project Visited: Cooperative Information Network

Period Studied: Fiscal Year 1976

1: INTRODUCTION

California is one of the largest States in both size and population, and has a reputation for well-developed, "activist" involvement in the management of its library system. The State Library Agency has a great deal of autonomy even though it is a part of the State Department of Education. The State Library Agency is highly regarded by Californians--in a recent survey, State residents rated it as one of the ten best public service agencies in the State, while the Department of Education was rated as one of the ten worst. The State Librarian was appointed by the Governor and has been serving in that capacity over the past six years. In the library profession, the State Librarian is a recognized leader, both statewide and nationally.

Libraries in the State are funded primarily by local taxation authorities, and managed through 20 public library systems in the State, five of which are single jurisdiction systems. The primary thrust of State involvement in funding is toward public libraries, but many of the systems include other types of libraries. Funds, amounting to approximately $1 million annually, are authorized by the Public Library Services Act of 1963.

One of the principal thrusts of State policy is to encourage statewide planning for a system that will provide the best possible services to all Californians. State policy is, therefore, strongly behind the movement towards cooperative efforts among libraries in the State. LSCA Titles I and III are used to assist in the implementation of these activities. However, it is interesting to note that local contributions to interlibrary cooperative and networking efforts amount to 95 percent of the total cost--thus, local systems are also fully committed to these methods.

A comprehensive review of public library system development with proposed guidelines for statewide library service in California for the decade 1975-1984 was prepared by Peat, Marwick, Mitchell and

Co. (PMM) and presented to the State Librarian on June 4, 1975. The work is entitled California Public Library Systems - A Comprehensive Review with Guidelines for the Next Decade. Following the publication of the PMM study, a Library Planning Institute was held on June 23-27, 1975 to discuss the findings and recommendations of the study. The State Librarian said that "the final report became a catalyst for change as much as an object for scrutiny." The Institute included over 100 participants including library trustees, friends, concerned citizens, and librarians representing every type of library. Its mandates were to:

- Develop a statewide plan to provide the best possible library service to Californians over the next decade, at an acceptable cost;
- Begin to shape that plan into a legislative package to give a workable structure and indication of adequate funding at the State level; and
- Use the data in deliberating and considering the recommendations in the 1975 PMM report.

Fifty of 82 respondents of an opinion poll taken at the Institute supported these key recommendations of the PMM report:

- Interlibrary loan funding formulae should be keyed to demand and based on transactions, rather than on population.
- A sustaining services fund should be created to support those activities which are essential to the enterprise as a whole, such as staff development and coordinated collection building.
- Equal access to public libraries in a region must be required.

The opinion poll and group discussion illustrated the preference by the participants for the PMM Alternative Recommendation of retaining and building upon existing Public Library System structures, incorporating all types of libraries into their organization, and using a statewide on-line union catalog to allow borrowing from the most convenient source, with access to major collections as needed.

Institute study groups produced ten programs for structuring and funding of interlibrary activities which were discussed at the final plenary session. Elements of these were incorporated into recommendations for a new legislative program, and plans for translating the recommendations into actual legislation were also developed.

Consultants play a key role at the State Library Agency. One of the administrative divisions of the State Library Agency is Library Development Services. Eleven consultants report to this office and are responsible for liaison with different geographic areas of the State, and in addition have subject specialties. For instance, the consultant for the Monterey Bay Area Cooperative Library System, North Bay Cooperative Library System, and the South Bay Library System is also the consultant to the Cooperative Information Network (CIN) serving the South Bay locale. Her subject specializations are Trustees, Friends, Bookmobiles and Extension Services. During the yearly evaluation of proposals, consultants help to determine who shall receive LSCA funding. The consultants also serve as proponents or advocates for the projects in their geographic area or specialization areas.

The California State Library Agency uses its LSCA III funds to support projects aimed at fostering State and local goals for the Library System. The State objectives for LSCA III funding are often, in fact, far more specific than the Federal guidelines. While it is felt that LSCA III funds are not sufficient for the needs of the State, they nevertheless have had the ability to generate valuable pilot projects. This site profile will describe the California State Library Agency's approach to the LSCA III program. In describing the State program, the activities of the Cooperative Information Network (CIN) project are highlighted to help illustrate California's policies and practices related to LSCA III.

2: MANAGEMENT OF LSCA III AT THE STATE LEVEL

California uses LSCA III as an integral part of its State Library Agency Program to fund pilot projects. LSCA III monies are disbursed to such projects through a formal proposal mechanism. As stated earlier, regional consultants play a major role in evaluating proposals and making funding decisions. When consultants have an LSCA III funded project in their region, they also serve as project monitors representing the State Library Agency and clarifying any Federal or State requirements to the project director.

Policymaking and funding decisions are based on needs assessment procedures, on objectives defined to serve those needs, as well as on the amount of funds available. The steps in this process from needs assessment through the allocation of funds are described below.

2.1: Needs Assessment

There has been no formal needs assessment performed which has implications for LSCA III activities alone. There have been several studies for total library service in the State. The most recent was the 1975 PMM report cited earlier. In general, the consultants at the State Library Agency feel that projects which have requested LSCA III funds are balanced among themselves, and that further efforts at needs assessment are not necessary. In general, where decisions require information as to needs, the perceptions and experiences of the State Advisory Committee are relied upon.

2.2: Defining LSCA III Objectives and Priorities

There are both Federal objectives and State objectives and priorities for the California LSCA III program. Review of LSCA III objectives at the Federal level does not result in changes in the State or project objectives. Setting objectives for LSCA III projects in the State is enhanced in its effectiveness by the fact that a high State priority is to establish and support library cooperatives and networks. Studies which have been conducted and input from conferences are also very useful in setting objectives for LSCA III projects. The State long-range programs and LSCA III regulations are considered to be relatively useless in setting objectives for LSCA III projects.

2.3: Policymaking Relative to LSCA III

In California the State Library Agency management and planning staff are involved in all aspects of LSCA III policymaking. The LSCA III Advisory Council is involved only in the areas of setting priorities and determination of criteria for and allocation of the LSCA III resources. Policymaking activities are formally performed once a year with informal modifications made to some aspects of the policy as needed.

Policymaking is, to a large extent, based upon the State's planning, rather than Federal guidelines, but the two are often parallel, and rarely contradictory. State goals are often much more specific than Federal requirements.

2.4: The Role of the LSCA Advisory Council and State Library Agency Personnel in LSCA III

The Advisory Council in California responds to concerns communicated to it by the State Librarian according to the Chief of Library Development Services. Its members assist in evaluating LSCA III programs, plans, and activities as an extension of a request by the State Librarian, "Implicitly, they recommend policy, but explicitly they do not." They do participate as reviewers of proposals but this impact is not seen as particularly significant. The State Librarian asks for nominations from the field for persons to serve on the Advisory Committee. It serves only LSCA purposes. One third of its members are not professionals in the library field. It is planned that the proportion of lay membership will increase in the future.

Several members of the State Library Agency staff are actively involved with LSCA III projects. The State Librarian has the final authority to approve the budgets for LSCA III projects. The Chief of Library

Development Services serves the LSCA III coordinator function. The Federal Program Officer does all the budgetary accounting for LSCA III. The Library Development Services Consultants have varying roles depending on whether they are responsible for an LSCA III project in a given year.

2.5: Allocation of LSCA III Funds

Allocation of LSCA III funds in California follows a formal set of procedures, with proposals solicited from the field annually. Informal solicitation of proposals for specific projects is also a method utilized frequently. The proposals received are evaluated by the Advisory Council and the consultants at the Agency. The criteria considered to be of the greatest usefulness in the evaluation are: the soundness of procedures or the operational plan, and the degree to which the project addresses high priority needs. Another important criterion is the capability of the project to obtain funding beyond the initial LSCA III grant from sources other than LSCA III.

This method is considered to be extremely responsive to current emphases but has been criticized for being too vulnerable to "political proposals." Also, when writing proposals no concrete guidelines exist for objectives. For example, the Cooperative Informative Network (CIN) coordinator mentioned the problem of sometimes feeling that she works in a vacuum when planning future activities for the project. How the project relates to the State program was often perceived as being unclear.

2.6: Budget Preparation and Controls

LSCA III funds are managed through what is essentially a system of forward funding: the plans of the projects are received, and decisions are made using this information. Advance planning takes place only to the extent that the budget for the fiscal year (June) is set in the preceding December. The State Librarian considers the availability of stable funding to be very important to the development of new systems.

Currently, the project directors, with the help of others in the project and the fiscal officer(s) of the jurisdiction, are involved in the preparation of the budget for LSCA III projects. The individual consultant specialist who is working with the project is also involved from the beginning. The regional consultant acts as the advocate for the project, and after meetings with the other consultants concerning priorities, may recommend changes in the project budget which accord with the overall picture.

The meetings of consultants serve as a review process by the Library Development Services Division of the State Library Agency for the projects. Recommendations of this Division are then passed on to the Assistant State Librarian and the Financial Grants Officer whose recommendations are then passed on to the State Librarian. The Advisory Council, which receives summaries of the projects requesting funding, then meets with the consultants to discuss the relative merits and demerits of the projects. This process is used for the actual selection of projects for funding and the amounts which will be granted.

The State Librarian feels that the entire mechanism allows for equal scrutiny for budget preparation of LSCA III projects as well as for other library programs. No one else, it is felt, should be involved in preparing the budget. The final authority to approve the budget for LSCA III projects is the State Librarian. Administratively, the State Library Agency is a division of the State Department of Education, but it acts with complete autonomy and has a separate budget.

2.7: Evaluation by the State Library Agency

The evaluation of projects consists of the quarterly and yearly formal written reports and informal monitoring. State Library Agency personnel, specifically the assigned consultant, conduct these monitoring activities. The monitoring consists of site visits, the gathering of testimony and phone calls. The Chief of Library Development Services feels that a formal needs survey would be of value to the State but has not been conducted because of fiscal constraints. The chief also observes that "there is really no consistency of evaluation because the evaluations are designed and used by the projects." This was borne out when speaking with the consultants. The only consistent and effective reporting was the LSCA required quarterly and annual reports and the use of informal oral reports on a monthly basis. Section 6 describes in more detail the monitoring role.

3: IMPACT AND USE OF FEDERAL AND STATE REQUIREMENTS AND CONTROLS ON LSCA III ACTIVITIES

Major legislation affecting libraries in California was recently signed into law by the Governor. It is entitled "California Library Services Act" (CLSA-PL 792). It will result in some substantial changes in the library cooperative situation in the State. It will provide for "universal borrowing" and the establishment of two or more major State reference centers. One of these will emphasize special service to the economically disadvantaged and/or the limited English-speaking. The opinion of personnel at the State Library Agency is that because of this possible change, the Five-Year State Program is relatively useless. Other LSCA III requirements were reviewed by the State Librarian and her comments are summarized below.

The Annual Program is considered to be useless for planning library cooperative and network projects because it is not considered a planning document. The basic State Plan is considered to be very useful. Its utility is its maintenance-of-effort requirement, but, as a planning document, it "is of no value." It was not constructed as a planning document, but as a "conformance document."

The feeling is that "internal and statewide reporting and evaluation which we use is good (and improving)." Reports to the Federal government are of no use to the State. The emphasis on needs assessment and on evaluation are both considered very useful, but there is some doubt about whether this information, when obtained by the State, is in fact used.

The Chief of Library Development Services at the Agency feels, that with time, the role and relationship of the State Librarian and the State Advisory Council will emerge. The State Librarian is looking to strengthen the Advisory Council. The Council met twice in 1976. When the Council met with the consultants to evaluate proposals the last time, it was a three-day meeting.

The Chief of Library Development Services feels that formal surveys would also be of value to the State although not necessarily of value to the funded projects. These formal surveys are not conducted because of fiscal constraints. He also feels that the current requirements are approximately equal in value to the project and to the State Library Agency. The State requires quarterly and annual reports from the projects to meet LSCA requirements.

4: USE OF LSCA III FUNDS BY THE STATE LIBRARY AGENCY

4.1: Types and Numbers of LSCA III Projects Funded

There is no discernible pattern to the type or number of projects funded with LSCA III in California. The method for allocating funds allows for the greatest flexibility in selecting proposals. A summary of these projects is presented in the following table.

There were four projects funded in Fiscal Year 1976. The Cooperative Information Network is discussed at length in Section 12.

LSCA III PROJECTS FUNDED IN CALIFORNIA, 1968 - 1976

YEAR	TITLE OF PROJECT	ADMINISTERING AGENCY	SOURCE OF FUNDS				USE		
			LSCA III	STATE	LOCAL	OTHER	SALARIES	EQUIPMENT	OTHER
1968	1. Fresno County Free Library-Extension of Service to Business and Industry	Fresno County Library	$ 19,053				$ 14,053		$ 5,000
	2. Total Interlibrary Exchange (TIE)	Black Gold Cooperative Library System	13,600				10,200	$ 2,900	500
	3. California-Nevada Interstate Cooperative	Lassen County Public Library	18,500				7,000	6,500	5,000
1969	1. State Library Enrichment Program	California State Library	9,392	$19,789			19,817		9,364
	2. Expansion of Fresno County Library Project	Fresno County Library	19,053		$ 28,970		33,753		14,270
	3. Expansion of TIE	Black Gold Cooperative Library System	12,200		18,561		22,821	1,500	
	4. North Coast Libraries Study	Eureka Public Library	4,000			Title I[1]	4,000		
1970	1. Fresno County Library Project	Fresno County Library	19,053		28,970		33,753		14,270
	2. State Library Enrichment Program	California State Library	9,392	19,789			19,817		9,364
	3. TIE	Black Gold Cooperative Library System	12,200		18,561		22,821	1,500	6,440
	4. California-Nevada Interstate Cooperative Project	Larsen County Public Library	6,000				3,500		2,500
	5. North Coast Libraries Study	Eureka Public Library	4,000				4,000		
1971	1. State Library Enrichment Program	California State Library	6,327	41,915			16,241		32,001
	2. Fresno County Library Project	Fresno County Library	5,901		20,000		17,872		8,029
	3. TIE	Black Gold Cooperative Library System	23,000		15,000		5,000	6,000	15,000 (contractual) 12,000
	4. Development of Periodicals Network	Cooperative Library System San Joaquin County	7,000				6,000		1,000
1972[2]									

[1] Amount and use not available

[2] Data not available.

LSCA III PROJECTS FUNDED IN CALIFORNIA, 1968 - 1976 (Continued)

YEAR	TITLE OF PROJECT	ADMINISTERING AGENCY	SOURCE OF FUNDS				USE		
			LSCA III	STATE	LOCAL	OTHER	SALARIES	EQUIPMENT	OTHER
1973	1. TIE	Black Gold Cooperative Library System	$ 10,917	$10,180	$ 473,494		$ 339,202		$ 155,389
	2. California-Nevada Interstate Cooperation	San Diego County Library	1,000	3,704	25,837	Title I[1]	20,768		9,773
	3. Expansion of Periodicals Network	Cooperative Planning System San Jonquin County	10,000	5,245	302,295		215,927		101,613
	4. North State Interlibrary Cooperation	North State Cooperative Library System, Butte County	10,000	6,015	499,329		350,434		164,910
	5. Development of Cooperative Information Network (CIN)	Camino Real and Santa Clara Valley Library Systems	30,000	8,943	865,561		615,062	$ 1,130	288,312
	6. Cooperative Acquisitions and Retention - An Intertype Library Project	Pasadena Public Library	8,715	6,168	525,166		367,234	500	172,315
	7. Expansion of Reference Network and Research Facility	Mountain-Valley Library System	8,402	6,105	499,276		349,372		164,411
	8. Completion of Fresno County Project	Fresno County Library	5,000	4,320	12,920		15,123		7,117
	9. Communication Among All Types of Libraries	Serra Library System	5,000	4,320	12,920		12,724		9,516
	10. Development of Interlibrary Cooperation in Monterey Bay Area	Salinas Public Library	10,000	770	12,920		16,110		7,580
1975	1. Demonstration of Multi-Library Service through a BALLOTS Network	Stanford University	85,997	115,341	4,189,708		3,029,822		85,997 (contractual) 1,275,227
	2. Administration of LSCA	California State Library		298,758			349,705		19,000 (contractual) 138,114
1976	1. Expansion of CIN	Santa Clara Public Library	15,000	21,399	250,000		219,509		66,890
	2. California-Nevada Interstate Network	Lassen County Library	2,961	14,698	2,419,750	Title I[2]	2,076,686	7,500	353,223
	3. Demonstration of Multi-Library Services through a BALLOTS Network	Stanford University	30,997	14,698	500,000		397,800		147,895 (contractual)
	4. Regional Clearinghouse for Library Automation	Association of Bay Area Governments	37,039	13,400			43,300	2,400	

[1] Amount granted not available.

[2] Amount granted not available.

The California-Nevada Interstate Communication Network was the second interstate network which has received LSCA III funds ($2,961). It was considered very useful because it was picked up by local funds in a rural county with limited funds.

The Demonstration of Multi-Library Services through a Bibliographic Automation of Large Library Operations using a Time-Sharing System (BALLOTS - based at Stanford University) Network was funded for $30,997. The State Library Agency refers to the project as the Public Library Automation Network (PLAN). The objectives were to:

- implement "shared cataloging" through BALLOTS;
- provide interaction among members and with BALLOTS;
- improve usefulness of BALLOTS to members via systems analysis; and
- perform detailed cost analysis.

The project has also been continued using local funding.

The fourth project in Fiscal Year 1976 which was funded with LSCA III funds was the Regional Clearinghouse for Library Automation which was based at the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG). It was funded for $37,039. The State Library Agency consultant considered the project somewhat successful. The project was a demonstration of library automation efforts. The project was intended to "pull the needs of libraries together in a regional planning group." The project gave librarians exposure to planners and gave visibility to libraries. The project was funded for two years and then dropped. It was considered complementary to other State-supported cooperation and networking efforts.

4.2: Products and Services Resulting from the Availability of LSCA III Funds

Some specific products mentioned at the State Library Agency include the following: retention of systems personnel, estimated at a full-time equivalent of five employees; installation of two TWX terminals; and funding of two special studies.

The LSCA III funds have allowed for participation in approximately 20 regional cooperative projects and for staff development. "Breakdown of barriers" has also been facilitated with the use of LSCA III funds. Although the State Library Agency serves as a centralized clearinghouse of requests and has been establishing a union catalog, this has been funded with LSCA I funds and not LSCA III.

Products resulting from the availability of LSCA III funds to the CIN project specifically are: the CIN Directory, a newsletter, seminars, and the partial sponsorship of three librarians to serve as liaison in the three library systems which are served by the Cooperative Information Network. During this last year, a staff development component has been added to CIN.

4.3: Adequacy and Ratios of Funding Sources

The public library systems lie at the heart of any networking or cooperative efforts in the State. This is because they have benefitted, since 1963, from receipt of State funds which encouraged their formation. These systems are well established and reflect the wishes of the librarians in the State as expressed at the June 1975 Institute. They will continue to be the basis of future cooperative efforts. These systems, like most of the individual public library members, are supported by local taxes--primarily local property taxes.

The State Librarian estimates that the local government's share of support for the overall development of interlibrary cooperation and networking in the State is about 94 percent, and feels that this percentage should be decreased to 85 percent. Eventually, they will be assisted by the cooperatives. Duplication will be minimized and cost savings should result.

The Federal contribution toward networking and cooperative efforts in the State consists of approximately four percent of the total amount. The State Librarian feels that the support should come from LSCA III to cover five percent of the total amount. "If the networking effort which is being financed is on a national scale the Federal obligation should be more, similar to the funding of the highway system. There must be variability for differences... the State Agency should remain as the distribution center."

The State contribution toward these efforts is now estimated at two percent. While this should be changed somewhat by the passage of PLSA, the proper proportion of the total funding the State should undertake, according to the State librarian, is ten percent for intrastate use.

4.4: Use of LSCA III Funds to Join Existing Cooperatives and Networks

LSCA III funds are used to join existing cooperatives in California, and it is felt that this is an effective use of the funds. LSCA III funds act as an incentive. The Chief of Library Development Services feels that it is better to use State funds for this purpose, but they are not presently adequate. The PLSA of 1963 provides for automatic distribution of funds to libraries in systems, but it has never been funded for more than $1 million a year. Public Law 792, which was enacted in the Summer of 1977, should improve this situation.

4.5: Other Funds Used for Interlibrary Cooperation

The California State Library Agency actively encourages resource sharing among libraries so that all users of public libraries, as well as other kinds of libraries, have access to the materials and information held in California and elsewhere. Because of the significant public library (or institutional library) benefit of this approach, many projects with significant interlibrary cooperation components have been funded with LSCA I.

The following table presents a list of 1975-76 LSCA I projects with significant two-way intertype (interlibrary cooperation) components, together with their total LSCA I funding and an estimate of the approximate amount of funds included in the total for interlibrary purposes (potential LSCA III) that may have been involved.

A significant venture in the development of library cooperation in California is CLASS: The California Library Authority for Systems and Services. Founded in 1976, CLASS was established to develop and implement projects and systems for library resource sharing and program development to provide for:

- cooperative development and maintenance of common bibliographic and holding data bases;
- development and implementation of interlibrary loan and delivery;
- development and operation of systems for cooperative use of cataloging data, cooperative acquisition, and other forms of resource sharing; and
- development and implementation of library systems for information exchange.

CLASS is open to all libraries throughout the Nation. Membership fees and LSCA I funds are used to pay for the System's operating costs.

4.6: Restricted or Discontinued LSCA III Projects

Projects which were begun with LSCA III funds which are currently supported by other funds include the Total Interlibrary Exchange which began with LSCA III funds and merged in 1974 with the Black Gold Cooperative Library System. (Total LSCA I funding for 1976-77 was $118,000.) The Public Library Automation Network at Stanford University was started within LSCA III funds and then funded by the State for $320,000 from June 1, 1976 to June 30, 1977, when funding terminated.

The South Bay Cooperative Information Network was started in 1971-72 with LSCA III funds. The growth of this project has been hampered due to unavailability of funds. The original grantee was the Camino Real System.

LSCA I PROJECTS FUNDED IN 1975-76 WITH SIGNIFICANT TWO-WAY INTERTYPE COMPONENTS AND AN ESTIMATE OF THE FUNDING FOR THOSE COMPONENTS[1]

NAME OF PROJECT	TITLE I AWARD	EST. INTERTYPE AMOUNT
Black Gold Information Center and Total Interlibrary Exchange (TIE)	$ 127,450	$ 30,000
East Bay Cooperative-Oakland Information Services	78,000	5,000
49/99 Interlibrary Cooperation Reference Network	105,000	5,000
Inland ILS Reference Project and SIRCULS Inter-type Library Network	145,211	40,000
Mountain Valley Information Center	151,302	25,000
North Bay Reference Referral Services	77,700	5,000
North State Reference and Intertype Cooperation Project	159,516	15,000
San Francisco Public Library Regional Resources Project	336,393	50,000
San Joaquin Valley Information Service/Area Wide Library Network	75,215	15,000
Santiago Libraries of Orange County Network	102,000	20,000
Serra Systemwide Reference Center Services	217,927	10,000
Ben Lomond Youth Conservation Camp	9,900	2,000
California Conservation Center	5,000	3,000
Sonoma State Hospital	77,111	3,000

---

[1] No figure is given for total funding level because there is no uniform way of calculating local in-kind contributions. Many other projects have significant intertype activity, but the LSCA I fiscal contribution to them is so small, they are not listed here. Also not listed are projects in which the intertype activity is one-way; e.g., an institutional library receives services from a public library, but does not reciprocate.

5. STATE MEMBERSHIP IN INTERSTATE COMPACTS AND MULTISTATE NETWORKS

From 1974 to June 1977 California was a member of WICHE. In July of 1977 the library council separated from the higher education council to form the Western Council of State Libraries. California will continue to be involved with this group in the foreseeable future. Individual counties also have agreements with neighboring States and counties. An example is the LSCA III supported California-Nevada Interstate Communication Network which was discussed in Section 4.1. It is the feeling at the State Library Agency that there is not disproportionate use of library resources in this State due to the consortium compact. It is also the feeling that there is not a disproportionate use of library personnel in this State.

6: INTERACTION BETWEEN THE STATE LIBRARY AGENCY AND LSCA III PROJECTS

The State Librarian feels that networking on a national level should be a national responsibility and intrastate networking the responsibility of the State. The State level is not strongy influenced by Federal requirements. It has a strong commitment to supporting cooperative efforts especially public library systems and uses State funds for these purposes. The Regional Program Officer was consulted on only one of the LSCA III projects funded in Fiscal Year 1976, otherwise the State consultants had no contact with him, and the CIN coordinator has had no contact with him.

The State Library Agency has been particularly visible in the State because of the PMM study, the follow-up Library Planning Institute, and the recently passed library legislation. The public library systems dominate cooperative efforts in the State and will continue to do so in the future.

State involvement in local activities depends on State Library Agency consultants, and their relationship with their respective projects has to be good for them to succeed. The consultant represents the project at the annual funding decision meetings. No other contact between the State Library Agency and the project is required or expected to occur. The consultants reported that there was communication between them and the projects at least every six weeks. Meetings and oral reports were of much more value to them than were the written reports required by LSCA III.

7: STATE AND PROJECT LEVEL ASSESSMENT OF LSCA III PROGRAM MANAGEMENT AT THE FEDERAL LEVEL

7.1: Technical Assistance

Comments regarding LSCA III management, technical assistance, monitoring and dissemination were very noncommital. One State Library Agency official said there is only "paperwork accountability" and that the "Federal Government treads lightly on State administered projects." There has been hardly any contact with the Regional Program Officer.

7.2: Monitoring of Projects

When consultants have an LSCA funded project they also serve as project monitors representing the State Library Agency. They also clarify any Federal or State requirements that affect the project. The Regional Program Officer is seen to have a secondary role. This was consistent with the comments of other consultants responsible for projects in Fiscal Year 1976 in evaluating responsibility for monitoring projects. Others who were mentioned as having secondary responsibility were the Chief of Library Development Services and Federal Programs Officer of the State who is responsible for the financial reports on all LSCA III projects.

7.3: Dissemination of Information and Materials

There was no awareness of Federal level dissemination. However, State consultants mentioned several dissemination activities, including the California-Nevada Interstate Communication Network project for which the person who was primarily responsible was the county librarian involved in the project. The consultants also mentioned that there was a special edition of News Notes of California Libraries, the official journal of the California State Library

(v. 71, no. 2, 1976) which was devoted to LSCA in California. Compiled by a State Library Consultant, this special issue describes all 140 LSCA funded projects in the State from the beginning in 1956 through June 1976, Each listing gives the name of the project, the type of activity, the dates, the duration of the funding, and the amount spent. The data are followed by a brief summary paragraph describing the objectives and results and a very short appraisal of the success or failure of the project.

An editorial, "News Notes of California Libraries" by John Berry, in the June 15, 1977 Library Journal, recognizes this special issue. He commented on its value for every librarian, State Library Agency staffer, or library "leader" who is about to join that small, but growing, chorus of disenchantment with the Library Services and Construction Act (LSCA). He further said that this same kind of report should be demanded from every State Library Agency.

> "When the Library Services Act (LSA) came in 1956, six of of California's counties had no library service. All of rural California was inadequately served. Little had been done to build cooperative systems, and the State badly needed long-range planning. Through LSA and LSCA, service was extended to every county in the State; the massive, 1964-65 Public Library Service Equal to the Challenge of California, by Lowell Martin and Roberta Bowler, along with other LSCA funded studies, were sufficient to stimulate local, county, and State initiation and funding of new library services.... [and further, that] ... Before you cast your lot with those who would dump the funding formula of LSCA, [and who] would label "outreach" efforts as doomed, get a copy of LSCA in California and demand the same report from your State Library Agency. It is the best ammunition we've seen yet to defend Federal aid to libraries, and to show our legislators, our public, and our own leadership that Federal money can build State and local commitments to library service."[1]

---

[1] John Berry, "News Notes of California Libraries," Library Journal, June 15, 1977.

8: THE FEDERAL FUNDING FORMULA

This section summarizes the State Library Agency's opinions of LSCA III funding.

8.1: Matching Versus Nonmatching of State and Federal Funds

The California State Library Agency staff are not satisfied with the fact that LSCA III funds are distributed on a nonmatching basis. They feel that they need leverage for a State match if they want to encourage State funding. Local matching is also desirable. A specific formula was recommended: in the first year the funding should be 75 percent Federally provided; in the second year an even split between local and Federal sources should be required; and in the third year 75 percent of all funding would come from the local or State agency.

8.2: Impact of Increased Federal LSCA III Funds

California's method of funding submitted proposals can be readily adapted to changes in funds. They simply fund more or fewer projects based on the total amount available. They indicate that if funds were tripled, they would use the funds for more activities similar to those currently funded, to accelerate the current program in order to achieve its objectives more quickly, and to reach more libraries with existing services.

The Cooperative Information Network (CIN) Project Director feels capable of expanding the project to the neighboring counties if given more funds, and is interested in "arranging an interface." The CIN Director would "reproduce programs from other places and arrange to have them reproduce some of ours." Also a last-copy retention center should be established as well as a delivery system. "Eventually I would like to see a statewide cooperative so there could be conformity of operation and the establishment of standards. When someone says 'a request has been filled' this should have the same meaning to everyone." The Director believes that a statewide or regional level cooperative should precede any plans for one on a national scale.

9: IMPACT OF LSCA III IN CALIFORNIA

The feeling at the State Library Agency is that the vast majority of network and cooperative efforts are LSCA I, not LSCA III. LSCA III started pilot projects, but the spread of these statewide is accomplished with LSCA I funds. The State Librarian feels that although LSCA III is not a large amount of money, it is entirely beneficial. There should be more LSCA III and less LSCA I funds.

10: STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES OF LSCA III

Items which were mentioned as strengths include the following: focus on sharing existing resources rather than buying locally, which breaks barriers, and demonstration to local jurisdictions how cooperation can benefit local users.

Some comments about shortcomings of the LSCA III Program are:

- "It implies that LSCA I is different and conflicting."
- "We need more funding on a continuing basis."
- "Funding is never for a long enough period to get going."
- "It is difficult to sell to individual governing bodies of multi-library networks when requesting local funding."
- "We want guidelines from the Federal level as to what is wanted."
- "Federal statistics are off."
- "If left to the States right now it won't get done."
- "Locals can't pick up the tab for the whole thing."
- "Need a longer term commitment."
- "The projects [personnel] often feel they are over paperworked."

- "Their information is not helpful."
- "They should make more use of the free cooperative principle."
- "We need a Federal commitment to networks (inter-type library cooperatives)."
- "Too many start-stop projects."

11: FUTURE DIRECTIONS FOR USOE

All persons interviewed were asked for their views on the future directions they thought the Federal government should take with regard to library cooperative and network projects as a means of providing library and information services. The comments of the State Librarian, the Project Director, and librarians covered a number of issues.

On the issue of the direction of library cooperation, there was a definite trend favoring increased Federal involvement in the development and maintenance of library cooperatives and networks. The State Librarians drew the analogy of library networking as something which resembles the development of highways. There is a need for a National network but there must be equal emphasis on within State flexibility to respond to the variety of situations and needs which States may not share. In this model, the State Library Agency would function as district centers.

A second direction USOE should consider is the willingness to support cooperative efforts for periods exceeding one year. That is, there needs to be some reliability in the funding so that projects can be designed, implemented, and evaluated. Currently, it is difficult to obtain funding from local and State sources when the full potential of a project cannot be demonstrated in a substantial manner.

Overriding these expectations, it is evident particularly at the level of the State Library Agency that both expectations for and dependence upon the Federal dollar is quite limited. The reasons for this include the fact that California does have a rather sizable tax base and as a result a comparatively higher level of support for library development. Also, California has been a traditional leader in the development of educational programs, and it is reasonable to expect that the philosophy underlying this has contributed to a willingness on the part of the State Legislature to support library development.

One problem noted by a librarian in the State is that those agencies currently active in the development of the concept of a national network. e.g., NCLIS and Library of Congress, may not be addressing the needs of the local library. That is, the local library may not be able to see the benefits; and as a result, high expectations may fall short of goals set for a national network.

Finally, the State Librarian expressed the need for some form of guidelines or standards at the Federal level so that projects developed or being selected for LSCA III funds could be selected with more than the hope that such a project would be workable and that funding be picked up by local libraries.

12: A DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF THE COOPERATIVE INFORMATION NETWORK

12.1: Services Offered by the Project

The Cooperative Information Network (CIN) is a multi-type library cooperative serving three library systems in the San Francisco Bay Area. It is comprised of four types of libraries: academic, school, public, and special and spans four counties. The purpose of CIN is to demonstrate a network which transcends geographic boundaries and puts the user in rapid contact with requested materials regardless of location. It has been in operation since 1972.

CIN sponsors three librarians who act in an advisory capacity for ten hours a week at each of the public library systems which CIN serves. These three systems are the Peninsula Library System (PLS), the South Bay Cooperative Library System (SBCLS), and the Monterey Bay Area Library System (MOBAC). (This last system includes Monterey County and Santa Cruz County.) These systems have different organizational frameworks and provide different services to their member libraries.

A CIN-sponsored librarian is located in the bibliographic center of the PLS; at the South Bay Area Reference Network (SBARN) center in the San Jose public library for the South Bay Cooperative Library System; and at the MOBAC headquarters in Salinas for the Monterey Bay Area Library System.

CIN also conducts seminars. The topics presented are chosen as the result of suggestions from the field such as computer application in libraries and copyright problems. The seminar on computers was presented by a panel made up of librarians from different CIN member libraries knowledgeable in the field. The CIN coordinator indicated this is the usual method for designing a program. This particular seminar had a large number of attendance applications resulting in the offering of two programs, and even then the project could not fill requests for attendance. Attendance at all seminars is cost free. Because the seminars have been conducted on a variety of topics there was some discrepancy in reactions to them obtained from directors of participating libraries. They seemed to, sometimes, mistake seminar topics for actual services provided by the project.

The members were, perhaps, more familiar with the staff development component of CIN which was added in FY 1976-77 than they were with the seminars. CIN had not planned on including this component in their program, but three separate public library systems in the State (all in the greater San Francisco Bay Area) had requested financial assistance from the State Library Agency to provide in-house staff development. The State Library Agency responded by adding the staff development component to CIN which serves two of the requesting systems. The director of this staff development component of CIN feels that this larger intertype library service base is a distinct advantage. The programs can include discussions about networking and cooperatives of intertype libraries which would not have been possible if the program were based in a public library system. CIN also has a program of staff exchange and tours of member libraries.

When the member libraries spoke about this component of CIN, their comments included the following: "This service is still in the planning stages." "I have made relatively little use of this, it is aimed at public libraries" (from a college library director). "They offer it but, to us, it is of limited value." "Staff development is not too possible here because we don't have a young staff, only one professional is under 58 years old." This last comment was made by a library director who responded in the affirmative when asked if he currently received continuing education and training service from CIN. He responded in the negative when asked about all other possible services he might be receiving from CIN.

CIN sponsors five TWX machines at different locations. At one of these locations the library director indicated that if CIN sponsorship of the TWX ceases, the library would pick up the expense because it had proved its value. At another location, the library director indicated that the TWX was very heavily used. Interlibrary loans the year before the TWX was installed numbered less than 50; they now number around 2,000. His feeling is that because the TWX is more impersonal, the staff is more willing to ask for information from other libraries; also "it is a toy, [staff enjoy using it]."

Another service which CIN offers is a newsletter. There are 500 on the mailing list for the newsletter which is published irregularly. One member library director felt that it is "too cutesy" but another member library director commented that because of the cartoons he "always reads it." CIN also produces and distributes the CIN Directory of Libraries in San Mateo, Santa Clara, Santa Cruz and Monterey Counties. This currently includes about 340 separate listings: 192 units, 89 branches, 43 school libraries, and some in the miscellaneous category. The Directory includes information on its members, a manual describing CIN's rules, regulations and management, and appendices which show the CIN Organizational Structure, the CIN Union List of Newspapers, and the Folk Index of Local Experts. The Union List of Newspapers and the Folk Index of Local Experts are the results of short term projects which CIN undertook.

The major library in the network is the Leland Stanford Junior University, a private institution, which provides CIN with space for their headquarters and free access to the collections of the University's several libraries. The Director of Libraries at Stanford has been instrumental in promoting the Cooperative Information Network from the beginning. The Project Director frankly admits that without the commitments from Stanford, it is possible that CIN would not exist at all. The tremendous resources of Stanford and the guidance and generosity of the Director of Libraries were mentioned often at the member libraries.

Stanford has a Technical Information Service which charges for membership. The service is used by private businesses and special libraries. Through membership in CIN, interlibrary loan and interlibrary reference from Stanford are available at no charge. The CIN coordinator has had a problem in finding common agreement on a definition of a library as a criteria of membership because some businesses and professional offices with book collections have asked to become CIN members in order to be able to access the Stanford resources. The Stanford Research Institute-International (SRI), which is a CIN member and therefore eligible for free service, still does all of their interlibrary loan through the Technical Information Service at Stanford because the librarian feels that their needs for service are so great that they would overburden CIN to the extent that it would not be able to provide for other CIN members. This SRI arrangement also allows Stanford to obtain funds to support their library development. It should be mentioned that SRI-International has tremendous resources itself which are available to other organizations at no charge.

The CIN coordinator feels that the project provides a liaison function. This was mentioned often at the member libraries. One library director said he is very satisfied to have "established a working relationship with other organizations and libraries." Another said "We are getting to outsiders, it's less provincial." A system coordinator said the benefit of the cooperative is the "interrelationships of reference directors of libraries; it's of greater benefit than the savings on books especially in public libraries."

The librarian at SRI said the advantage of being a member of CIN was that we are "involved with all types of libraries and librarians, are more aware, and they are not isolated." A college library director said an advantage of membership in CIN is the "opportunity to meet with others." Because librarians know each other, staff is more likely to ask for assistance from other libraries in answering reference questions.

12.2: Funding Sources

The CIN project is currently funded by LSCA III, the State, and local funds for $15,000, $21,399, and $250,000, respectively. The State Library Agency has asked that, for next year, the members pick up a greater percentage of the operating costs.

12.3: Interaction with the State Library Agency

The focus of interaction between the project and the State Library Agency is the LSCA III coordinator and the State Library consultant assigned to oversee CIN. The project staff meets with State Library Agency personnel on a monthly basis and submit written reports on a quarterly basis. The project staff was not pleased with the role of the State Library Agency *vis a vis* the project. There are too many reporting requirements and little feedback on quarterly reports. The project staff felt the need for reaction on technical issues and not just fiscal matters. There was not a sense of whether the project 'fit' into the State's Program and Plan. The use of consultants was also questioned because they have little power to effect change in State policy and funding decisions.

12.4: Staffing

The CIN project has two full-time librarians. One is the CIN coordinator, the other is the coordinator for the staff development component. There are four part-time librarians. One is at each of the library systems and one is at the Stanford headquarters of CIN. There are also two part-time clerical employees.

12.5: Role of the Project Advisory Panel

There are three groups of an advisory nature associated with the CIN project. The CIN coordinator sends a copy of activities to the State LSCA III Advisory Council and at the same time to the State Library Agency. Secondly, there is a CIN Reference Advisory Council. This consists of 20 reference librarians who meet three or four times a year. They must give their approval on all brochures which are distributed by the project. They get copies of all materials that go out of Cooperative Information Network offices. The Project Director says that these activities are done on an informal basis. All the members are heavy users of the network and they are asked to serve as volunteers on the Reference Advisory Council by the Project Director.

The third group is the Board of Directors, with 20 members who meet monthly. They interact with and give direction to the Project Coordinator. The Directors are usually administrators of member libraries who are able to commit their libraries to any decisions which are made. Each county has a specified set number of representatives. Each member library system determines how the representation of different types of libraries will be handled, and representatives are elected as terms expire. The Board has the authority to approve or disapprove any CIN project. They also have the authority to dismiss the Project Coordinator. The arrangements for these activities are informal, with no contractual agreements.

12.6: Problems

The inadequacy of funds has been a very serious problem. The lack of assurance of continued financial support has also been a serious problem. The Project Director feels that the need to write yearly proposals is too burdensome; it does not allow time to evaluate the prior year's results before the next year's proposal is due. This tends to encourage the writing of proposals without the sufficient documentation to support achievement of previous goals and objectives. It encourages "slick writing for its own sake and for the perpetuation of the project, necessary or not. Funding should permit longer range planning such as a minimum of three years.

The Project Director also sees two other very serious problems. One is human attitudes. There is too much apathy and inflexibility. Another is the high personnel turnover in libraries. This requires ongoing inservice training in cooperation and identifying with the project.

Another problem which member library directors mentioned concerns cooperation, in general, and not specifically CIN. While no one feels that large library resources are strained, they do feel that net lenders should be reimbursed. This is specifically addressed by the new State legislation.

12.7: Evaluation by the LSCA III Project

The Cooperative Information Network solicits participant feedback through the distribution and collection of dialog sheets at all workshops. The Project Director explained that the "seminars and workshops are [developed as] a result of a survey so it is a response [to the needs and to the evaluations of participants]." There is a staff exchange program which CIN arranges which is also in response to requests.

The Project Director feels this project has been very successful in reaching its first two objectives which are the establishment of a reference network and facilitating interlibrary loan. "Statistics are up, visibility is up and librarians are more comfortable about calling in." The seminars on networking are thought to be very important because librarians are knowledgeable about the network and more likely to fill a user request using resources outside his/her library.

12.8: Impact

The project serves essentially as a facilitator of interlibrary loan. A college library director says of CIN, "This network fits in, does not make a thing of itself. It is a catalyst of interlibrary loan and does not focus on itself." Often, CIN members use other members as backup resources, but because the service or resource is available anyway, there is no need for requesters or suppliers to identify themselves as CIN members. Because of this, it is very difficult to evaluate the benefit of membership to CIN or to evaluate the network at all.

Member library directors were questioned about the value of this facilitator function. Responses varied. "We don't need the organization, they are not providing a new service." "Any library could go to Stanford but they wouldn't." "Berkeley and Stanford won't loan to anyone within fifty miles so we look into CIN for resources." "For a special library of our large size it has limited value."

At a community college library, the director said the impact is "none ... Our questions are generally pretty simple. We don't have to use MOBAC or CIN very often." This same director goes on to say that they "use interlibrary communication for requests even when their own copy is circulated because they get a response in two or three days." Often heard was "we are able to get materials we wouldn't otherwise be able to get." At a college library, the director said the biggest users were adults--faculty and older students.

One public library director feels very strongly that cooperative "costs outweigh the benefits ... Cooperation and interlibrary loan are directed at one percent of the library regular users." When he sees this "relative large amount of money for a relatively small number of patrons" it is very disconcerting. He would rather have his share of the money for his own operating budget but the only choice is getting the service or not getting it. He feels that colleges, universities, and special libraries get the greatest benefit from cooperatives. The reference librarian at this library disagrees strongly with the director's comments. This librarian feels that CIN encourages users who were not users before. The library does about 40 or 50 interlibrary loans a month, and the librarian feels this is a very valuable service.

There was no consensus on the type of library which benefitted most from cooperation, but because the State Library Agency obligation legally is to the public libraries, they have been the chief beneficiary of those State and Federal funds which encourage cooperation.

12.9: Role of the Project in State's Cooperative and Networks Efforts

CIN is one of two intertype cooperatives in the State. The other is the Total Interlibrary Exchange (TIE) affiliated with the Black Gold Cooperative Library System. It was begun with LSCA III funds but shortly after it was started Federal Funds were frozen and TIE funding was picked up by the member libraries.

The State Library Agency has seen the project as a demonstration and expects the members to start picking up the funding. As a demonstration project CIN is expected to demonstrate the positive benefits of library cooperation in terms of responsiveness to user requests, continuing library education, and furthering the concepts of networking and resource sharing.

12.10: Project Relationships with Other Library Cooperatives and Networks

The CIN does not have any formal agreements with the three library systems in its service area (Peninsula Library System (PLS), the South Bay Cooperative Library System (SBCLS), and the Monterey Bay Area Library System); it is "strictly a courtesy thing," says the Project Director. In addition to the direct relationship of CIN with the three immediately served systems, there is a public relations exchange arrangement with the East Bay Information System (EBIS). The types of activities that CIN and the three public library systems engage in include: the providing and receiving of services, attendance of problem-oriented meetings, joint planning activities which began with the incorporation of the staff development component in CIN, and informal communications.

INTERLIBRARY COOPERATION AND NETWORKING: A CASE STUDY OF LSCA III AT THE STATE AND PROJECT LEVEL

State Visited:	Minnesota
LSCA III Project Visited:	Minnesota Interlibrary Telecommunications Exchange (MINITEX)
Period Studied:	Fiscal Year 1976

1: INTRODUCTION

According to the State Librarian of Minnesota, cooperation and networking is the number one topic of discussion among Minnesotans concerned about libraries. It is where many people put their emphasis, and is at the forefront of library development. Limited economic resources coupled with the information explosion have made people more aware of the need to share resources and meet patron expectations for higher levels of services.

Several unique characteristics about Minnesota affect the direction of networking activities in the State. First, the University of Minnesota is the only publicly supported university in Minnesota, and no major private university exists in the State. The over three million cataloged volumes in the University of Minnesota's collection almost equal the combined total of all the rest of the State's higher education libraries and is almost three times as large as the State's largest public library--the Minneapolis Public Library and Information Center. Also, the University Library is one of the largest library resources west of the Mississippi River. Over 75 percent of the State's library resources and 50 percent of its population are located in the seven-county, Twin Cities Metropolitan area, while the remaining 25 percent of the library resources and 50 percent of the population are distributed over the other 80 counties.

Another important characteristic is that the State Library Agency in Minnesota is in actuality the Office of Public Libraries and Interlibrary Cooperation (OPLIC), Division of Administration, within the State Department of Education. The office has no library collection and will never be as large as an organizationally autonomous State Library Agency such as Illinois'. The Minnesota State Library Agency's legally-stated functions are to:

- Advise and consult to local libraries, public officials and citizen groups on matters related to library services. Traditionally, this was confined to public library service.

- Administer State and Federal aids for public library service and construction and for interlibrary cooperation.
- Provide interlibrary loan backup services and reference assistance to local public and school libraries.[1]

Its responsibilities are primarily for public libraries. Backup services are mentioned for school libraries. However, no specific mention is made of academic or special libraries except as they relate to the administration of State and Federal aid for interlibrary cooperation.

In 1973, the Office of Public Libraries and Interlibrary Cooperation (hereafter referred to by the generic term, State Library Agency) divested itself of responsibility for the purchasing, processing, and distribution of books and other library materials as well as providing general reference and interlibrary loan services to other libraries. Responsibility for the latter two services was transferred to the St. Paul Public Library which supplies these services under contract with the State Library Agency. Also, reference services provided by the State Library Agency were modified to serve exclusively the professional information needs of librarians and media personnel.

The major interlibrary activity occurs through the Minnesota Interlibrary Telecommunications Exchange (MINITEX). MINITEX links 146 academic, public, State agency, and special libraries and interfaces with a number of specialized subject networks and consortia. MINITEX activities include resource sharing, development of bibliographic data bases for serials and monographs, backup reference and media personnel.

A major program of the State Library Agency is developing and strengthening of regional public library systems. Thirteen multi-county systems provide access to public library services to

---

[1] Adapted from "Minnesota Long Range Plan for Library Service: 1977," Minnesota Libraries, 25:4 (Winter 1976-77), p.103.

3.4 million persons or 93 percent of the State's population. Twenty-four counties remain with no county-wide library service. Minnesota distinguishes between library materials that are accessible, that is, on call from a library agency in the region, and those that are available at hand in each library agency. The regional public library systems are a means of increasing the accessibility of library materials throughout Minnesota.

The State Library Agency sees the development of multi-type, multi-county cooperative groupings as an area needing attention because it increases the accessibility of library resources. As yet, there is only one such grouping.

2: MANAGEMENT OF LSCA III AT THE STATE LEVEL

2.1: Needs Assessment

The assessment of needs having implications for LSCA III activities in Minnesota is an ongoing activity, and the methods used are informal. The ones found very useful are soliciting of comments from the field, collecting input from the State Advisory Council, and reviewing proposals received from the field.

Results from the needs assessment were used very extensively as input into the following LSCA III policymaking activities: developing objectives, determining priorities to achieve objectives, modifying objectives and determining criteria for project selection. Because the needs assessments are largely informal, the results were used less extensively for providing documentation to support decisions and for determining funding allocations.

The reason given for not conducting statewide needs assessment surveys is that Minnesota has moved beyond the stage where such surveys can be useful. The State Librarian believes there is no need for a large-scale, externally-managed survey because Minnesota is at a point where involving its librarians in development of a statewide interlibrary cooperation system is essential. At this time he believes it is more appropriate for each library to survey the needs of its users. The State Librarian mentioned the possible use of outside consultants to assist libraries in surveying the needs of its users. A statewide needs survey has not seemed as high a priority as judging if efforts at interlibrary cooperation get the user the materials requested.

2.2: Defining LSCA III Objectives and Priorities

The objectives of Minnesota match perfectly with the objectives of the LSCA III program. The State's networking goal is to:

> "encourage, facilitate, support and lead in the development of networks of libraries of all types in the furtherance of effective and efficient sharing of resources to the ultimate benefit of the citizens, individually and collectively, of the state."[1]

LSCA III has an important role in terms of the State Five-Year Plan. The library networking section of the plan is very important because it sets down the goals and objectives for cooperative programs among all types of libraries in the State.

The State Five-Year Program, the interlibrary cooperation/network plans, and the results of needs assessment are used in setting objectives for LSCA III projects and are described by the State Library Agency as moderately useful. LSCA III Federal regulations are also used but are not considered useful because they are too broad and do not give a lot of direction. However, the State Librarian stated that the resulting flexibility and freedom was desirable. While review of LSCA III objectives sometimes may result in a change in objectives, the single most important factor influencing the decision to change LSCA III objectives is based on funding, i.e., the possibility of switching some projects to State funds thus freeing up LSCA III for other projects.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 105.

2.3: Policymaking at the State Level Relative to LSCA III

The LSCA Advisory Council is involved in determining criteria for allocating LSCA III resources. In Minnesota, the State Librarian also performs the role of the LSCA III Coordinator and is involved in all the steps of the policymaking process: assessing needs, setting priorities, setting objectives, determining criteria for allocating LSCA III resources, and allocating LSCA III resources. The USOE Regional Program Officer is informally involved in all these steps with the exception of allocating LSCA III resources. The State Librarian and Regional Program Officer discuss policy issues during the Regional Officer's quarterly visits to the State and also during telephone conversations.

2.4: The Role of the LSCA Advisory Council and State Library Agency Personnel in LSCA III

The primary role of the Advisory Council relative to LSCA III projects is to recommend policy. This activity is implemented mainly by the Council's assistance in developing and reviewing the long-range program. The Council recommends future directions for library development in Minnesota. In addition, the Council identifies areas in the Annual Program that should receive emphasis. When the Council and the State Library Agency staff disagree on a recommendation, it is reported to the State Board. Usually the Board supports the State Library Agency. However, these disagreements have concerned, to date, LSCA I rather than LSCA III projects.

The Council also advises on the development of the State Plan and advises on budget matters only in the broadest sense. Its input on these activities was judged by the State Librarian to be highly significant. The Council has not been involved in formal evaluations of LSCA III programs and activities but it does receive reports on LSCA III projects.

In 1976, the Council was reorganized. The number of members was reduced from 38 to 15 in an effort to increase effectiveness by increasing the involvement of each member. Another change was to select members based on their potential contribution to the functioning of the Council rather than their position. As a result, Council members now represent a wider range of residents in the State.

As required by LSCA regulations one-third of the Council members are lay persons. A nominating committee selects members of the Council and solicits nominations along with the State Library Agency. The State Board chooses the final Council members from the nominees. Two people are selected from each of seven Congressional Districts in Minnesota, and one person is selected from the eighth district to achieve geographic representation. The State Librarian is satisfied with the operation of the Council, and has not heard any complaints from the library community about its composition. One minor, possible problem is that because of its small size, the Council might be temporarily weakened if a member were to resign. However, this has not yet occurred.

The State Librarian is the only member of the State Library Agency staff actively involved with LSCA III Projects with an involvement of only about one-half day a month. The State Librarian would have to spend more time if the current Project Director were not so able and competent. The Assistant State Librarian and other State Library personnel are involved only in the sense that they work on the State Plan which includes LSCA III projects.

2.5: Allocation of LSCA III Funds

The State Library Agency distributes LSCA III funds in accordance with plans for a statewide network and solicits proposals informally from specific individuals or institutions for specific projects. These methods are judged useful. While the current level of LSCA III funding is insufficient to warrant soliciting proposals from the field, this method would be used if more funds were available. When reviewing proposals for LSCA III the following criteria are used:

- relationship to the long-range program for library development;
- soundness of procedures or operational plan;
- adequacy of personnel and facilities;

- capability of integrating funded activities into a permanent program of services; and
- degree to which the project addresses high priority needs.

The State Librarian judged all these methods as very useful.

2.6: Budget Preparation and Controls

The LSCA III Project Directors prepare the budget for each project. The budgetary control utilized by the State to monitor the expenditures of the LSCA III project consists of review and approval by the State Librarian. Until recently, this review was done annually, but it is now done on a quarterly basis. The budget is also reviewed annually by the statewide Advisory Council, the Project Advisory Council and, in the case of MINITEX, the Higher Education Coordinating Board. The mechanism by which the budget is prepared was rated very adequate by personnel at the State Library Agency. Within the State, the State Librarian has the final authority to approve the budget for LSCA III projects.

2.7: Evaluation by the State Library Agency

At the State Library Agency level, four methods are most commonly used to evaluate LSCA III projects. Two of the methods are informal. The first consists of ongoing feedback from library personnel participating in project activities. The second consists of unsolicited feedback from the ultimate users of services. The other two methods used are more formal and consist of analysis of cost and usage statistics, and of records of numbers of persons having access to project services. The two formal methods were used last in July 1976. The State Library Agency conducts annual evaluations of LSCA III projects on a formal basis, and bimonthly evaluations of MINITEX on an informal basis. All four methods were judged by the State Librarian to be very useful for determining continued support of a project and for justifying recommendations to the Board of Education and to the Legislature.

Currently the State Librarian is primarily responsible for conducting evaluations of LSCA III projects. If LSCA III funds were increased and if more projects were undertaken, then this responsibility would be shared with other staff members. The Minnesota Higher Education Coordinating Board also is responsible for conducting evaluations of MINITEX.

3: IMPACT AND USE OF FEDERAL AND STATE REQUIREMENTS AND CONTROLS ON LSCA III ACTIVITIES

3.1: LSCA Requirements/Controls

Except for the project report, all the requirements contained in the LSCA III legislation were rated very useful for planning for library cooperative and network projects. The usefulness of the project report was questionable from the point of view of the State Librarian because "the report does not really show what is happening." One improvement made in the report in 1976 was that projects were asked to report funding received other than LSCA III, thus better reflecting the scope of the project.

3.2: State Requirements/Controls

The State Librarian judged the State's legislation regarding State LSCA III program goals to be neither supportive nor restrictive in the following three areas:

- authorization to work with all types of libraries;
- monitoring of LSCA III projects; and
- goals of LSCA III efforts in Minnesota.

However, at present, there is no enabling legislation for multi-type cooperation under the leadership of the State Library Agency. There are no legal barriers against the State Library's participation in multi-type library cooperation, but there are financial barriers. Current State grant appropriations to the State Library only fund aid or services to public libraries.

The LSCA III Program resulted in a change in the State legislation that impacts cooperation and networking efforts. Specifically, the MINITEX program was funded through legislative appropriation to support the participation of Minnesota higher education institutions in MINITEX. The appropriation is made from a general fund and is listed in the Higher Education Coordinating Board budget as a line item.

4: USE OF LSCA III FUNDS BY THE STATE LIBRARY AGENCY

4.1: Types and Numbers of LSCA III Projects Funded

The following table presents the LSCA III projects funded from 1969 to 1976. Data were unavailable at USOE or at the Minnesota State Agency for 1967 and 1968. However, the State Librarian believes these two years were spent in statewide planning for interlibrary cooperation. Analysis of the projects funded indicates that MINITEX has received LSCA III funds every year from 1969 to 1976. MINITEX received LSCA III funds for the two years that it was a pilot project (1969 and 1970); and subsequent to being operationalized, it has received funds for expansion and the development of the Minnesota Union List of Serials. In 1969, MINITEX received $11,875 from LSCA III funds which was matched by the same amount of State funds. In addition, it received $103,200 from the Lewis W. and Maud Hill Family Foundation (now the Northwest Area Foundation).

LSCA III money has also been used for trial demonstrations. In 1974 a pilot project to explore the feasibility of a reference component for MINITEX was funded for $20,000. This activity was found to be successful and is now continued with permanent State funding. It should be pointed out that in the year being studied, 1975-76, LSCA III funds provided approximately ten percent of the MINITEX budget and that in 1976-1977, LSCA III funds are providing approximately five percent of the MINITEX budget.

A review of the way project funds were used indicates a major amount of funds have been spent contractually.

4.2: Products and Services Resulting from Availability of LSCA III Funds

The State Librarian attributed the following products and services to the availability of Federal LSCA III funds and Federal emphasis on interlibrary cooperation and networking:

- installation of 25 TWX terminals in libraries;
- participation in regional cooperative projects;

LSCA III PROJECTS FOR THE STATE OF MINNESOTA, 1969-1976

YEAR	TITLE OF PROJECT	ADMINISTERING AGENCY	SOURCE OF FUNDS				USE		
			LSCA III	STATE	LOCAL	OTHER	SALARIES	EQUIPMENT	OTHER
1969	1. Collaboration with State Technical Services, Technical Information Service (TIS)	State Technical Services Program, University of Minnesota	$3,023	$3,023					$6,045 (contractual)
	2. Minnesota Interlibrary Teletype Experiment (MINITEX)	(as above)	11,875	11,875					23,750 (contractual)
	3. Development of Metropolitan Library Service Agency (MELSA)	Metropolitan Library Service Agency (MELSA)[1]							
	4. Statewide Study of Library Resources and Requirements	Higher Education Coordinating Commission	3,144	3,145			3,397		2,892 (contractual)
1970	1. MINITEX	State Technical Services Program	28,322	286					57,116 (contractual)
	2. Development of MELSA	Metropolitan Library Service Agency (MELSA)	14,000	14,000	191		21,476	306	6,406
	3. Newspaper Indexing Study and Report	(as above)	700	700					1,400 (contractual)
1971	1. Development of MELSA		16,397	16,397					32,794
	2. MINITEX	MINITEX Office							
1972	MINITEX and Minnesota Union List of Serials (MULS)	MINITEX Office	49,606	184			45,120	1,991	2,679
1973	Expansion of MINITEX and MULS	Office of Public Libraries and Interlibrary Cooperation	51,258	45,000					6,258 (contractual)
1974	1. Expansion of MINITEX and MULS[1]	MINITEX Office							
	2. MINITEX Reference	(as above)	20,000						20,000 (contractual)
	3. Expansion of TWX Network	Office of Public Libraries and Interlibrary Cooperation	14,000						14,000 (contractual)
1975	Expansion of MINITEX and MULS	(as above)	48,664	23,336					72,000 (contractual)
1976	Expansion of MINITEX and MULS	(as above)	48,664	421,336					470,000 (contractual)

[1] Data not available

- development of the Minnesota Union List of Serials (MULS);
- development of document delivery from the University Library;
- development of backup reference services;
- implementation of a centralized clearinghouse of requests; and
- staff development.

4.3: Adequacy and Ratios of Funding Sources

For Fiscal Year 1976, the adequacy of funding provided for cooperative and networking projects in Minnesota was assessed in the following way. Funding was judged to be very inadequate at the Federal and local levels. Funding at the State level was judged as adequate.

4.4: Use of LSCA III Funds to Join Existing Cooperatives and Networks

The State Librarian felt that use of LSCA III funds to join existing cooperatives or networks is an effective use of Federal funds because State restrictions made it difficult to use State funds for this purpose. Also, the philosophy in Minnesota is that Federal funds should be used for developmental purposes and to try new ventures rather than for continuing operations. The availability of Federal funds acts as an incentive for joining existing cooperatives or networks.

4.5: Other Funds Used for Interlibrary Cooperation

During Fiscal Year 1976 Minnesota had a project conforming to the LSCA III emphasis on interlibrary cooperation, but which was supported with other funds. The MINITEX project, for example, received funds from the State, and $20,000 of LSCA I funds were used to pay for on-line charges, staff training and OCLC terminals for a Regional Library System that processes library materials for 38 member public libraries. In the second year of operation the libraries will pay for their own costs. Also, in 1975-76, outside funding amounting to $216,066 from the Bush Foundation of St. Paul and $88,000 from the Kellogg Foundation allowed 30 MINITEX academic libraries to join OCLC. In the first year of operation MINITEX picked up 100 percent of the start-up costs which included the cost of terminals, installation, and profiling. MINITEX support in the second year was 50 percent of the cost to cover tapes, training, coordination, and billing. By the third year the total cost will be borne by the local library.

4.6: Restricted or Discontinued LSCA III Projects

According to the State Librarian, no projects begun with LSCA III funds that were important enough to continue were restricted or discontinued due to the unavailability of funds. One project, INFORM, started in 1972, was discontinued because participating libraries decided to continue the program independently in each library.

5: STATE MEMBERSHIP IN INTERSTATE COMPACTS AND MULTI-STATE NETWORKS

Minnesota is not a member of an interstate library compact and has no plans to join; however, Minnesota is a member of a multi-state cooperative project, the Midwest Region Library Network (MIDLNET). MIDLNET is a regional, multi-state network designed to provide coordination and a focal point for library development in the region It emphasizes services that are not feasible at the State level or that could be provided more economically and efficiently through a multi-state group. The advantages associated with membership in MIDLNET are increased access to library resources and library personnel with specialized skills. However, the State Librarian pointed out that membership in such a multi-state network did not necessarily constitute a better use of funds when contrasted to support of intrastate networks or cooperatives.

6: INTERACTION BETWEEN THE STATE LIBRARY AGENCY AND LSCA III PROJECTS

LSCA III projects use the following methods to report to the State Library Agency: Project Advisory Council meetings held on a quarterly basis, annual written reports which will soon be converted to quarterly reports, an annual formal oral report to the State Advisory Council, and frequent informal oral reports on the telephone about once every two months. With one exception, all of these reporting methods were rated very useful by the State Librarian and the Project Director as a means of keeping the State Librarian updated on the progress of the project. This exception is the oral report to the State Advisory Council which the Project Director rated to be less useful than the other methods.

7: STATE AND PROJECT LEVEL ASSESSMENT OF THE LSCA III PROGRAM MANAGEMENT AT THE FEDERAL LEVEL

7.1: Technical Assistance

Technical assistance provided by the Regional Program Officer is viewed as very useful by the State Librarian. An example of the impact of technical assistance is the change made in the structuring of the Minnesota LSCA Advisory Council which resulted after the Regional Program Officer described how Councils were structured in other States. The Project Director felt that the quality of technical assistance provided by the Regional Program Officer had some slight positive impact on the project. For example, the Regional Program Officer gave the Project Director the name of someone to call at Office of Libraries and Learning Resources (OLLR) about HEA II-B grants. Also, as a result of technical assistance from the Regional Program Officer, the State modified the way in which data were collected to evaluate outputs of LSCA III projects and services.

7.2: Monitoring of Projects

Project monitoring provided by USOE through the Regional Program Officer in connection with the LSCA III project consists of review and feedback on written reports such as the long-range program, the annual program, expenditures reports, and project reports; site visits to projects at least once a year; and brainstorming sessions. The State Librarian judged all three methods as very useful. The Regional Officer conveys a great deal of information about activities in other States by having a good understanding of each State and relating experiences in other States to the needs and resources of Minnesota. The project monitoring provided by the Regional Program Officer had no impact on the project that the Project Director could determine.

7.3: Dissemination of Information and Materials

Both the State Librarian and the Project Director rated dissemination activities at the Federal level as good in most cases. However, the Project Director of MINITEX pointed out that these activities at the Federal level have had no impact on the project.

8: THE FEDERAL FUNDING FORMULA

8.1: Matching Versus Nonmatching of State and Federal Funds

The State Librarian is dissatisfied with the current funding formula by which LSCA III funds are distributed on a nonmatching basis, and would prefer that State matching funds be required especially because the LSCA III amounts have been so minimal. Although the State Legislature is sensitive to maintenance-of-effort required by the Federal government, the State would likely accept and match LSCA III funds if required to do so. The State Librarian would like to see the basic amount of the Federal LSCA III grant increased by 500 percent. Also, there is a preference to see local government agencies match LSCA III funds received from the State; however, the State Librarian feels this matching should be a State rather than a Federal requirement as it may have to be introduced gradually.

8.2: Impact of Increased Federal LSCA III Funds

If the amount of Federal LSCA III funds received by the State was tripled, the funds would be used:

- to accelerate the current program to achieve its objectives more quickly especially those related to the development of multi-type, multi-county library systems;
- to reach more libraries with existing services such as those provided by MINITEX and the sharing of resources on a multi-county level;
- for new activities, such as greater multi-type activities at regional levels that cannot be presently conducted because of lack of funds; and
- for more computer terminals.

Money would not be spent on more TWX terminals because there are enough in the State. Computer terminals would be used for data base searching for the public.

When asked about the Federal funding formula, the MINITEX Project Director agreed with the four activities listed by the State Librarian and, in addition, identified the following changes that could be made to the project if unlimited project funds were made available:

- Complete the biographic data base of monographs by retrospective conversion of existing holdings or by using other available data bases.
- Develop an inventory control/circulation system to determine the availability of materials.
- Improve local collections. Ninety-five percent of a library's needs should be met locally.
- Build a centralized storage center. Minnesota libraries have space problems. When doing retrospective conversion librarians can select marginal use books to send to storage, thereby reducing duplicates.
- Hold forums to define roles of individual libraries and networks at the local, regional, multi-state, and national level. This process of role definition is continuous.
- Expand participation in MINITEX to include school and special libraries.
- Provide access to audio-visual materials.
- Put the Minnesota Union List of Serials (MULS) file on-line.
- Switch the communication system to an integrated access terminal.

The Project Director stated that if funds were tripled, only one month would be required to prepare for their use. By contrast, the State Librarian felt a minimum of six months to prepare for their use would be required. The State Librarian needs more time than the Project Director because the projects would be new as opposed to the Project Director expanding in areas in which the project was already working.

9: IMPACT OF LSCA III IN MINNESOTA

9.1: Development of LSCA III Projects Without Federal Funds

The State Librarian and the MINITEX Project Director both agree that without Federal support in the form of LSCA III funds, the development of networks and cooperative projects in Minnesota would have been less extensive and that some projects would not have been started. Furthermore, the State Librarian believes that multi-type library development, such as MINITEX, would have been far more limited. LSCA III provided startup money. Without LSCA III, public library development would have occurred but not intertype library development.

9.2: Achievement of LSCA III Projects

The State Librarian judged that projects funded with LSCA III funds contributed better than expected to the accomplishment of the overall objectives of the State Library Agency.

The Project Director did judge the overall impact of LSCA III projects on library services in Minnesota as being somewhat positive. However, there was a belief that LSCA III funds were used to enable public libraries to participate in multi-type library projects rather than to encourage all types of libraries to participate in multi-state library projects. The Project Director believes that LSCA III is a tremendously exciting idea. The Federal Government has played a critical role in the project and in library networking generally. However, implementation has been difficult and it is a miracle that it was successful. In most States, LSCA III funds were administered by people who had no experience in administering projects.

9.3: Predictability of Funding and Its Impact on Cooperatives

Currently the maximum planning period for LSCA III and State funds is two years and one year for LSCA I funds. The State Library Agency is in the process of shifting LSCA III funds from MINITEX to other projects. The predictability of Federal funding has negligible impact on network development in Minnesota. The

State Library Agency has always assumed it would be available. State funds can be used to keep things going until the Federal monies arrive. If LSCA III funds stopped, network development would not slow down, but the State Library Agency staff might have to work harder to find alternative funds for planned projects.

10: STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES OF THE LSCA III PROGRAM

Two principal strengths of LSCA III were identified by the State Librarian. First, the current Program is flexible in the sense that policy is not dictated to the States. Second, LSCA III emphasizes services for all types of libraries. The principal shortcoming is the low funding level. The Project Director on the other hand, felt that one strength of the LSCA Program is that it focuses the interest and concern of local and State government and of foundations on library service. Other strengths are that it provides the potential for innovative library service and the ability to support interstate activity. Weaknesses of the Program are that it does not give enough attention to national standards, such as bibliographic standards and communication protocols, and that it is too little money for what it tries to achieve.

11: FUTURE DIRECTIONS FOR USOE

All persons interviewed were asked for their views on the future directions they thought the Federal Government should take with regard to library cooperative and network projects as a means of providing library and information services. The comments of the State Librarian, the Project Director, the Assistant Executive Director from the Minnesota Higher Education Coordinating Board, and librarians covered a number of issues.

On the issue of funding, there was general agreement that LSCA III funds should be increased. Also, some respondents felt that these funds should be used as seed money while others wanted LSCA III to be directed toward ongoing cooperatives. The cooperatives are in a better position to improve services because they are cooperative ventures. It was also felt that the Federal Government should fund multi-state cooperatives directly and also that funding on a discretionary basis should be undertaken.

With regard to program management, the State Librarian supported the regional approach currently used by USOE. More importantly was the near universal agreement of the need for a national plan for library and information services and the guidelines that should accompany such a plan. These guidelines or standards should be formulated to facilitate interfacing with other State networks (e.g., use of MARC formats). While there is a need for structure, it was pointed out that the Program should not implement highly specific regulations because of the State's need for flexibility to respond to unique local and regional problems. Two other recommendations concerning future Federal policy are particularly noteworthy and tend to summarize opinion in Minnesota.

- Currently there are unequal information resources in the 50 States. All States do not equally provide sufficient financial support for libraries. It is unrealistic to suggest that we need 50 State networks or that all the planning and money will come from the State Library Agencies. We need a coalescing of existing groups.
- Federal funding should be selective. Entitlements tend to promote the status quo. Funding should be consistent with National and State plans and objectives.

The views of library directors on future LSCA III policy are summarized below.

- It is an obligation of the Federal Government to provide access to resources and knowledge. The Federal Government should continue to encourage interlibrary cooperation. The Federal Government provides the means to unify all libraries. If States are left alone, their efforts will be fragmented.
- More money is needed over a longer period of time to have any impact. States usually deal with problems in two-year increments. The Federal Government could provide funds over a larger time frame of between five and ten years.

One librarian addressed the issue of where the primary responsibility for networking at the Federal level should rest. It was felt that the Library of Congress should be the foundation of a pyramid of inter-loan networks, be the agency responsible for raising funds and for coordinating to resolve jurisdictional issues. The Library of Congress is the only institution that properly qualifies because it has the largest collection, the expertise, and is the source of bibliographic data. In addition, the Ohio College Library Center or the National Commission on Libraries and Information Sciences should not be the dominant institution.

One librarian focused on why Federal funding should be increased. The librarian stated that funding for his public library is based 96 percent on local taxes. It is difficult to increase the amount of local taxes for public libraries because people are more interested in having local taxes spent on life support systems than on libraries. A more equitable split would be 50 percent from local funds, 30 percent State, and 20 percent Federal. Federal funds should be available as direct aid to urban libraries rather than as competitive grants. The argument evolved that urban libraries need basic operating money. They cannot do the basic things they were set up to do. Libraries should be able to qualify on the basis of population and need. However, a problem is that there are no national standards for libraries by which need can be judged.

Several librarians addressed the activities for use of Federal money. One librarian believed that Federal funding for networking should be used for all types of libraries and for including libraries in specialized information services such as the Capacity Building Project or the National Diffusion Network. In Minnesota because the amount of LSCA III funds is so small, it has been spent primarily to enable the public libraries to engage in cooperative activities with academic libraries rather than with school or special libraries. Another librarian believed that the Federal government should support services to patrons on a local level by engaging in activities that can be done best at a national level such as standardizing procedures or developing models. A third librarian felt that if Federal funding is provided for buildings, it should be only for cooperative storage facilities. One librarian believed that evidence should be required to ensure that projects funded with Federal funds are well managed.

12: A DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF MINITEX[1]

One of Minnesota's unique characteristics that led to the development of its project is that there are few universities in the State. There is only one publicly supported university and no major private universities. The University of Minnesota Library is the only major research library in the State. MINITEX (Minnesota Interlibrary Telecommunications Exchange) began in 1969 as a two-year pilot project to test the feasibility of sharing the University of Minnesota's library resources with patrons of libraries outside the Twin Cities Metropolitan area. MINITEX was supported in 1969 by a $103,200 grant from the Lewis W. and Maud Hill Family Foundation and matching State and Federal LSCA III funds ($11,875 each). The pilot project demonstrated that a State supported regular program would be practical, economical, and of considerable benefit to the State without undue detrimental effects on the service to the University's faculty and students.

The Minnesota Higher Education Coordinating Board (MHECB) submitted a request to the State Legislature for the support of an ongoing MINITEX program beginning July 1, 1971, and received $300,000 for the biennium 1971-73. The State Library Agency uses State and LSCA III funds for the inclusion of the public regional resource libraries and for additional pilot projects such as the MINITEX

---

[1] The description of MINITEX and its services was based on interview and survey data and on the following publications:

"Minnesota Interlibrary Telecommunications Exchange (MINITEX)" in MINITEX MESSENGER, 1.1 (May 74).

MINITEX Seventh Annual Report, July 1, 1975-June 30, 1976, mimeo, 11 pages.

MINITEX Shares, Minnesota Library Association, Brochure.

Reference Project. Begun as a pilot project, MINITEX is now a full-scale, operational program of MHECB. MHECB supported MINITEX because they found it educationally and economically sound, and because of academic libraries' overwhelming use of MINITEX services. MHECB felt support of a program such as MINITEX was a State responsibility; and if such projects depended on Federal funds, they would be subject to Federal priorities that might not necessarily coincide with State priorities.

12.1: Services Offered by MINITEX

An important concept of MINITEX is that it approximates a full-service network. It also acts as a facilitator and provides the mechanism for library and information resource sharing in Minnesota. It creates an environment conducive to cooperative activity. The emphasis is on cooperative decisionmaking rather than on a reporting mechanism. For participating libraries, MINITEX provides the following: supports a telecommunication network so librarians can easily transmit messages; develops bibliographic data bases containing information on where items are held; supports a delivery system to move items freely between libraries; provides backup reference service; and conducts a continuous education program to assist in the utilization of available resources and services. Each of the major components of the MINITEX program are discussed below.

Communication Network: Most of the libraries enter the communication network via TWX, but telefacsimile, computer terminal, courier, and mail are also used. The system allows librarians to transmit messages to each other as well as to the Central Office. An in-WATS line allows all participating libraries to call toll free and speak directly with a reference librarian.

Resources Sharing/Document Delivery: When their library patrons have an information need that cannot be met by their own library, the request is transmitted to the MINITEX Central Office. The MINITEX central staff locate and retrieve needed materials from over 40 libraries in the St. Paul/Minneapolis metropolitan area, photocopy or charge out the material, and prepare it for delivery. Requests not filled by resources in the metropolitan area are referred to other MINITEX members identified in the bibliographic data base or in local book and union catalogs.

Access to resources in Wisconsin is facilitated by a reciprocal system-to-system arrangement with the Wisconsin Interlibrary Loan System (WILS). Access to North Dakota resources results from a contract arrangement with the North Dakota Network for Knowledge. Requests which cannot be filled using these resources are referred to the Center for Research Libraries, the Regional Health Science Library Network, and the British Library, Lending Division. In addition, MINITEX serves as the State Agency for obtaining locations of needed items in the National Union Catalog at the Library of Congress.

Materials are delivered by commercial buses, United Parcel Service, first class mail, or local couriers. Most requested materials are available in the patron's library within two working days.

Bibliographic Data Base: Two data bases provide the location information about materials necessary for efficient resource sharing. The first data base, the Minnesota Union List of Serials (MULS) is produced in a five-volume set and is regularly updated in microfiche. It contains over 85,000 entries comprised of the periodical holdings of 221 academic, public, governmental, medical, seminary, and special libraries in Minnesota and North Dakota. MULS supports cataloging, resource sharing, and collection development in libraries. It is a major contributor to CONSER (Conversion of Serials), a national on-line data base. The MINITEX pilot project had established the need for a bibliographic data base. A serials list became the first priority when statistics revealed that 75 percent of requests were for photocopies of journal articles.

A second data base is being developed in connection with OCLC. Systematic on-line cataloging by Minnesota libraries using the OCLC system builds a machine-readable union catalog of books in Minnesota libraries and thus improves access to local library resources.

OCLC activity was initiated by a request from the Minnesota Council of Academic Library Directors for assistance in developing a common data base of monographs. After exploring available options, the decision was made to join OCLC on a cooperative basis. The librarians chose to function as one cooperative group instead of 30 individuals because they wanted the resulting data base to be as complete as possible from an identifiable date. Also, the librarians imposed uniform cost analysis in their cataloging practices starting with 1974-75 to monitor and evaluate the new system.

Information and Reference Network: This reference service began as a pilot project in 1974 using LSCA III funds. It was judged successful and was continued with permanent State funding. When limited resources constrain the local library's ability to answer its patron's queries, the librarian consults the MINITEX reference staff via a WATS line. MINITEX staff then use the University of Minnesota and metropolitan libraries to locate the needed information. Also, on-line searching of subject data bases such as ERIC, CAIN, and MEDLARS is available.

Continuing Education: An ongoing continuing education program assists librarians to fully use locally and centrally available resources and services. Local, regional, and State workshops and training sessions were held on reference, State resources, bibliographic data bases, on-line searching, and cataloging. Much of the training focuses on groups of catalogers, reference librarians, acquisition/serials librarians, and directors of OCLC participating libraries.

Collection Development: A viable resource sharing system, bibliographic knowledge of ownership, and documented usage patterns provide the necessary bases for a collection development program. MINITEX and MULS facilitate collection development for serials. First, serials librarians meet in monthly conference calls to discuss new subscriptions. They attempt to evaluate the need for the new title, to determine how many copies are needed, and to assign responsibility for its binding and retention. Second, a duplicate exchange program provides missing issues and bound journals. Third, because each library receives a copy of its MINITEX requests, it is able to know which materials it does not own and perhaps should own. Titles repeatedly requested are generally ordered. A desired goal is that eventually local libraries can have the collections needed to support their curriculum and to be responsive to 95 percent of their patrons' needs. Materials not frequently used can be acquired when needed from other sources. In addition, many libraries have submitted the titles of their unique and expensive sets. A clearinghouse file is maintained and may be queried by reference and acquisitions librarians.

Although MINITEX has accomplished much, the Project Director feels that only beginning steps were taken toward future plans in cooperative collection development, resource sharing and the building of bibliographic data bases. Vocational and technical schools and special libraries should participate in the project. Also nonprint materials should be shared and bibliographic access to monographs and audiovisual material is needed. Cooperative processing of library materials should also be considered. An on-line interactive communication system among all libraries capable of transmitting bibliographic data and requesting services is essential. The Project Director hopes that ultimately a statewide network will become a reality and interface with other State networks thereby forming a national network.

MINITEX has a $300,000 grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH) jointly with INCOLSA (Indiana Cooperative Library Services Authority) to solve problems concerning the methodology of linking holding statements to CONSER and upgrading a substandard union list to national standards. A problem with most union lists--and many of these no doubt would have been funded with LSCA III funds--is that most of them were considered as one-time projects. Money was not provided for continually updating them. To update a union list now is almost to redo it. When the Library of Congress stopped the Union List of Serials in 1965, access to the periodical literature was lost. Greatly improved access to periodical bibliographic information through machine-readable files, such as ERIC, now exists, but access to the literature does not exist because of the lack of location information.

12.2: Funding Sources

In 1976 and 1977 the income and source of income for MINITEX were as follows:

Source	FY 1976	FY 1977
Sales of products and services to members and others	$ 39,639	$ 321,596
LSCA III	48,664	48,664
Other Federal funds	421,336	421,000
Foundations		314,066
Monetary donations	95	134
Sales of surplus equipment and supplies		6,167
TOTAL	$509,734	$1,111,627

12.3: Interaction With the State Library Agency

The Project Director expressed a desire for more evaluation and feedback on the reports that were made. If more Federal money were forthcoming for cooperative projects, it would be good to see an increase in the amount of control by the State Library Agency such as the requirement that projects conform to national networking standards. Concerning the amount of assistance given to the project through the State Library Agency, discussion with the Project Director indicated that the agency lacks staff with the specialized expertise in the networking area where the project would need assistance.

From the point of view of the State Library Agency, the State Librarian has a primary responsibility for the monitoring of this project, and the U.S. Office of Education Regional Program Officer has a secondary responsibility. From the point of view of the project, the Assistant Executive Director for Interinstitutional Program Planning of the Minnesota Higher Education Coordinating Board has the primary responsibility for monitoring of the project. The

State Librarian has a secondary responsibility, and the USOE Regional Officer a minimal responsibility.

The project staff is primarily responsible for dissemination activities for the project. Activities occur usually yearly and consist of presenting papers at conferences and publishing articles in the State Library Agency's publications. The State Librarian felt that perhaps the project needed more attention, and that more journal articles should be written about the project. The Project Director felt that an annual report on the project should be published in Minnesota Libraries, a publication of the State Library Agency. This method of disseminating information about the project would ease the burden on the project staff in answering requests for information about the project.

The Project Director assessed the quality of the project's relationship with the State Library Agency as good. The role of the State Library Agency is primarily that of a public library agency. The Agency's concern seems to be for the public libraries in MINITEX rather than for interlibrary cooperation. And, unless the Agency's perception of their role changes, it will be difficult to improve the quality of the project's relationship with the State Library Agency because many of the library resources in Minnesota are in the academic libraries. The Project Director felt that the attitude of the State Library Agency reflected its constituents and staff who are, for the most part, public librarians.

12.4: MINITEX Staffing

During Fiscal Year 1976 there were four full-time librarians, one full-time computer-related person, nine full-time library technicians and paraprofessionals, three part-time technicians/paraprofessionals (the full-time equivalent of 1.5 persons), four clerical and other support staff, and 42 halftime students. All employees were paid with project funds.

12.5: Role of the Project Advisory Council

MINITEX has an advisory panel whose primary role at the onset of the project in 1969 was to develop a program budget and the first draft of a request for a legislative appropriation. These were then presented to and accepted by the Higher Education Coordinating Board and by the Minnesota Legislature. The Project Director assessed the quality of the relationship between the project and the advisory panel as excellent. The panel sets priorities for MINITEX and is a means of sharing the responsibility for policy and decisionmaking for MINITEX. The panel is comprised of representatives elected by the following groups: the State university, the private colleges, and the public libraries. The Director of the University of Minnesota Library, a representative of the University of Minnesota administration, the State Librarian and the Project Director are ex officio members of the panel. Because MINITEX is a membership program rather than a State subsidized program for academic and public libraries, the panel does not have representatives from school or special libraries.

12.6: Problems

The Project Director indicated there were no serious problems encountered in the operation of the LSCA III project. Moderately serious problems were: not enough funding, lack of assurance of continued financial support, and lack of support by the State Library Agency. A less serious problem was the difficulty in evaluating progress. A minor problem was not enough staff. The Project Director believes that if more funding had been available, progress would have been more rapid.

12.7: Evaluation by the LSCA III Project

MINITEX uses a number of formal and informal evaluation methods to assess the operations and impact of the project. Informal methods, including meetings with participating librarians, were judged most useful by the project staff. Three methods rated only slightly useful were formal surveys of operations at member libraries, formal surveys of users of the service, and informal feedback from the ultimate users of the services. In addition, analysis of project services is being conducted by King Research Institute as part of the NCLIS study of Interlibrary Loan and Photocopy. The study will analyze calendar 1976 MINITEX document delivery data. Statistical data charting the usage patterns of individual MINITEX libraries will become available to participants and will assist the libraries to develop their collections.

The Project Director reported that the participants' assessments of the project have been favorable in terms of the appropriateness of the project and its adequacy in meeting their needs. Most students or researchers in Minnesota know about MINITEX, and their use varies from library to library. Some libraries have a separate MINITEX Office. One reservation is that some people in the public library sector feel MINITEX should be a program of the State Library Agency rather than of the Minnesota Higher Education Coordinating Board (MHECB). However, the State Librarian, the Project Director, the University Library Director, and several of the academic librarians interviewed expressed satisfaction with MHECB's role. Indeed, the State Librarian felt it unlikely that MINITEX would become a program of the State Library Agency. A second reservation is that many librarians would like the project to provide additional services such as the ability to borrow audiovisual materials from other libraries.

The Project Director reported that MINITEX has been very successful in reaching its objectives. The resource sharing/document delivery objective has been surpassed. The other objectives related to the communication network, bibliographic data base, and reference service were met.

When asked what advice the Project Director would give someone starting a similar project, the following four key activities were identified:

- Use a pilot project to test the idea in a real situation.
- Have some service or product produced immediately to demonstrate the benefits of the project while planning and implementing long-range goals.

- Strike a balance between action and planning. Something can be "talked to death" in committees.
- Learn to develop consensus and to work in a cooperative mode rather than in an individual mode.

The Project Director also believed that it was important to start at the State level, to combine sharing of resources with the development of a data base, and to have the project identified with broad goals that transcend institutional or individual goals.

The Minnesota Higher Education Coordinating Board which administers the MINITEX program judges MINITEX to be an excellent example of:

- sound interinstitutional planning;
- superb sharing of interinstitutional resources;
- evidence that institutions can work together to serve the broader community; and
- assisting libraries of different types to relate to each other.

The State Librarian judges the project to be very successful. One reason given for success is that no participating library ever has to say no to a user's request. A second reason is that internal management is good. MINITEX delivers, and it delivers fast. A great deal of ingenuity was used in determining the best combination of delivery methods after considering all alternatives such as bus, courier, or mail. In addition, MINITEX has determined where professional staff is necessary and where less qualified staff will suffice. The staff do not let work pile up. They take pride in striving for the shortest possible turnaround time.

12.8: Impact

One way of measuring the impact of MINITEX is by the annual increase in the number of participants, of available resources and services, and of use. The pilot program began in 1969 with eight academic and two public libraries. The number of direct participants in 1977 is 67 academic, 3 special, 24 public, 1 school, 30 hospital, 9 State agency, 2 Federal agency and 5 seminary libraries for a total of 141 libraries of all types. In addition, hundreds more access the service through regional library systems and networks. All Minnesota residents have access to the State's library resources through their local library.

The increase in the number of participating libraries indicates not only the increased number of libraries where patrons have efficient access to resources outside their local library but also the increased number of libraries where resources are shared. Available services have grown from document delivery, a communication network, and continuing education to include two bibliographic data bases, on-line cataloging, and reference services.

The number of interlibrary loan transactions between Minnesota libraries had increased from 20,000 in 1967-68 to 356,464 in 1975-76. Also, in 1975-76, for the first time more resources were borrowed locally than from MINITEX. Other networks and groups of libraries shared more items among themselves than they received from MINITEX. When MINITEX was first operated, all items were borrowed from the University of Minnesota Twin Cities Campus Libraries.

Head librarians of nine libraries participating in MINITEX were asked to describe the impact MINITEX has had upon their patrons. All nine librarians indicated patrons have expressed satisfaction with project services. The greatest impact of MINITEX appears to be a new image patrons have of the library as an access point. Patrons are beginning to realize that their library can get them almost any traditional (monographs or serials) library material they want even if the library does not own it or if it is not on the shelf. One public library director stated that before the library was involved with MINITEX, interlibrary loans were discouraged because it was time-consuming and difficult to try to get materials from other libraries. Patrons had to go through a "third-degree" to prove they definitely needed this material. Now interlibrary loan is encouraged and offered as one more routine service.

MINITEX appeared to be well-known among library patrons. One college librarian stated that MINITEX was like a household word at his library and that businessmen and other members of the community used MINITEX as well as the faculty and students. A community college librarian stated that MINITEX gave the college a very high rating among the people in the community. A library aide at a public library said the library had MINITEX "groupies."

The extent of the impact was described by librarians as "tremendous, substantial, and very, very favorable." As evidence of impact the library director at a special library indicated that interlibrary loan requests grew from 500 in their first year of operation with MINITEX to 3,000 in 1975-76. A college librarian indicated that interlibrary loans increased from 300 in 1969-70 to 3,500 in 1975-76. A community college librarian stated that in the first year of access to MINITEX three quarters of the students used the service.

A college librarian indicated that MINITEX has saved the library $30,000 a year because the library has been able to cut journal subscriptions in half. In addition, although the total acquisitions budget has fallen by 50 percent the capacity to please the library's clientele has increased greatly. Also, this library has been able to concentrate purchases on early imprint books. Several librarians commented that MINITEX has provided access to materials they could not afford to buy and that patrons are saved a trip to the University of Minnesota Library to get materials.

The extent of the impact was described as limited by only one librarian. In that instance, patrons have expressed satisfaction with services, but also some dissatisfaction. Some students didn't get their materials in five days. The problem may have been with the library's internal mailing system, and the requests may not have reached MINITEX soon enough. The librarian acknowledged that MINITEX has made some positive difference in how patrons view the media center and in how they feel about their library and information needs being satisfield. At one public library, the library director judged MINITEX as a good thing but found it difficult to judge the extent of the impact on patrons because his library lends more than it borrows. Also this library had not greatly publicized or built up the service because it lacked the staff to handle additional requests. Another library director was not sure of the impact, and felt that patrons' reactions would be mixed. They might be aware that materials they want could be out because of MINITEX, but yet they know access to materials their library doesn't own is possible.

At each of the nine libraries an attempt was made to locate library patrons to access the impact of the project upon them. Six users were interviewed at four libraries. Users' comments corroborate the statements of the librarians about the new image of the library as an access point for all traditional library materials. Several users stated they couldn't do their work without MINITEX particularly because of the rapid turnaround time the system provided.

All nine library directors interviewed were satisfied with their library's current relationships with the project. They tended to be very satisfied with all the services received from the project, and judged MINITEX to be efficient. One college librarian was dissatisfied because private libraries bore a disproportionate share of the loan requests.

One library director was dissatisfied with the reference services because MINITEX could not meet his library's crisis-type deadlines. Because of this, the library no longer uses this MINITEX service.

The library directors identified a number of benefits resulting from membership in MINITEX:

- MINITEX is a resource base and a delivery system. MINITEX supplies these materials for users, provides access to more resources, and teaches librarians to share resources.
- Meetings provide a means of communicating and sharing problems, solutions, and goals with other librarians. MINITEX ties us to the rest of the State and to the Nation. It is our lifeline.
- MINITEX has been a vehicle for getting small libraries to cooperate.

When asked if participation would continue in the event that LSCA III funds were withdrawn and the member libraries would have to pay for services, most librarians visited in this study said yes. However, they felt, funding would be difficult.

One of the central issues in networking is whether the resources of the large participating libraries in the network are ever used to the detriment of the large library being able to serve its own patrons. This issue appears to be satisfactorily resolved in Minnesota. One aiding reason is that most lending libraries are free from elaborate procedures for lending materials. A MINITEX person checks the card catalog, retrieves the material, copies or sends the material, and ensures its return.

The Director of the University of Minnesota, the largest net lender, spoke favorably about the library's relationship with MINITEX. The Director had the library's acquisition budget increased by one third by legislative committees because these resources would be shared with all libraries through MINITEX. The increased budget helped to improve the attitudes of some librarians on the staff who were reluctant about MINITEX because of wear and tear on the library collection. Its operation is well organized and well managed, and materials are returned. Also, the MINITEX reference service relieves the University Library staff of some of the outside requests.

As part of the site visit, assessments of the LSCA III project by non-member libraries were sought. In Minnesota, six librarians were contacted: three were from public libraries, and one each was from a college, school, and special library. There were no other academic libraries that did not participate in MINITEX either directly or indirectly through a consortium.

The three public libraries in the sample were not eligible to participate in MINITEX because their Boards had voted against joining a regional system. Three of the librarians rated MINITEX as very important to the development of library cooperatives and networking in Minnesota for the following reasons:

- It showed librarians throughout the State the value of telecommunications technology.
- It provides access for people who live in small towns to a wider range of materials than their communities could support.
- Libraries are able to get access to periodical resources and concentrate the acquisition budget on more heavily used items.
- It is a benefit to be able to get together with other librarians to exchange ideas.

Special and school libraries do not participate directly in MINITEX; however, their patrons have access to MINITEX services through the public library. A special librarian reported wanting to receive services directly from MINITEX, however, feeling that providing access to the resources of special libraries for other participants might present a problem.

12.9: Role of the Project in the State's Cooperative and Networking Efforts

MINITEX has been very important in Minnesota's overall efforts toward interlibrary cooperation and networking development. Indeed, MINITEX has been the primary focus of the State's effort. However, the "Minnesota Long Range Plan for Library Service: 1977" identifies three additional areas of cooperative and networking efforts. The State Librarian believes that MINITEX and these three additional areas will evolve into a statewide system of library service.

First, since 1973, the State Library Agency has contracted with the St. Paul Public Library to provide and coordinate an interlibrary loan program and serve as the primary resource to eligible public libraries outside the Twin Cities metropolitan area. Materials available in the St. Paul Public Library are mailed out within 24 hours. The collections of the other MELSA (Metropolitan Library Service Agency) and CLIC (College Libraries in Consortium) libraries are searched and referrals made. Items that cannot be filled may be entered into MINITEX for processing.

Second, other networking services are provided by the regional public library systems for their branches and/or members. They provide a variety of cooperative services including common borrowers cards or system wide reciprocal borrowing, interlibrary loan, books by mail, cooperative processing, cooperative purchasing, etc.

A third activity is the South Central Minnesota Interlibrary Exchange (SMILE). It includes all the academic, governmental agencies, public, area vocational/technical institutes, and special libraries in nine south central counties. SMILE's programs include reciprocal borrowing and a courier service.

In Minnesota, regional and subject consortia, cooperatives, and networks include the following:

- Twin Cities Biomedical Consortium (Hospital Libraries in the Health Sciences Library at the University and the Medtronick Library).
- Minnesota Health Sciences Libraries (part of the Midwest Health Science Library Network and the National Library of Medicine).
- Libraries of the Consortium of the Minnesota Seminary Faculties.
- Capitol Area Librarians Consortium (CALCO) (government agencies).
- College Libraries in Consortium (CLIC) (seven private metropolitan colleges and the James J. Hill Reference Library).
- Tri-College University (a multi-state consortium of Concordia College and Moorhead State University in Minnesota and North Dakota State University, Fargo).
- Lake Superior Consortium (a multi-state consortium which includes institutions in Minnesota, Wisconsin, Michigan and Ontario, Canada).

All of these groups focus on common concerns. Most share their resources through reciprocal borrowing arrangements or through interlibrary loans. Various machine-readable files have been developed of holdings of members. Other network tools include union lists, book catalogs, and guides to special collections. Most of these groups use the MINITEX communication system or delivery system or have developed their own courier or delivery system. In the eight areas where there are several closely situated academic institutions, local couriers are supported by MINITEX. They deliver the batched MINITEX requests and regularly transport materials between the local libraries. In addition, MINITEX prints regional serial lists. Many of the groups issue a newsletter, and they all offer the opportunity for library staff to meet their counterparts to share expertise.

12.10: Project Relationships With Other Library Cooperatives or Networks

MINITEX has formal agreements with other cooperative projects or networks. The names and cost of membership associated with these affiliations are:

NAME OF NETWORK	ANNUAL COST TO MINITEX	ANNUAL COST TO NETWORK
• Wisconsin Interlibrary Loan System (WILS)	(reciprocal agreement, no cost)	
• North Dakota (contract arrangement)	0	$21,250
• Center for Research Libraries (CRL)	$100	
• British Lending Library (based on use)	$1,000	
• CONSER (Conversion of Serials)	Cost of inputting records	
• Council of Computerized Networks (CCLN)	$125	
• Midwest Region Library Network (MIDLNET)	$10,000	

The relationships with the first four groups listed above are primarily in connection with access to materials for interlibrary loan.

13: EVALUATION AND CONCLUSIONS

MINITEX, the major recipient of LSCA III funds in Minnesota, has had tremendous impact upon improved services to library users in that State. In 1976, LSCA III funds made up ten percent of MINITEX's budget. MINITEX was very favorably evaluated by the State Librarian, the Project Director, the Assistant Executive Director of the Minnesota

High Education Coordinating Board, librarians from nine participating libraries, and six users. It has introducted the image of a library as an access point for all traditional library materials.

It appears that through MINITEX, Minnesota has developed a satisfactory vehicle for interlibrary cooperation--especially among public and academic libraries. One area of contention is that some public librarians might prefer to have MINITEX under the aegis of the State Library Agency. However, the present arrangement appears to be effective. As one academic librarian observed, because the money comes from several sources, no one type of library or agency dominates the network.

The State Librarian feels that MINITEX is only one component in the statewide plan for library service. Other components are the regional public library systems, other existing consortia and networks, and multi-type groupings such as SMILE. The State Librarian feels Minnesota may be ahead of other States because of MINITEX, but that more needs to be done to develop a statewide network for library service.

An important question is "What role have LSCA III funds played in intertype library cooperation and networking in Minnesota in the past and what role will or can they play in the future?" Both the State Librarian and the Project Director said LSCA III funds have been important to intertype library development in Minnesota. However, there is some question as to the present use of LSCA III funds in Minnesota, based on this study. MINITEX has received LSCA III funds for nine years, from 1969 to 1977. For the last six years it has received the total amount of LSCA III funds available. While for one year these funds were earmarked for a pilot project in reference, during the other years and especially currently, LSCA III could be viewed as partial support of ongoing operations. Indeed, it appears to contradict what the State Librarian indicated is the Minnesota philosophy of use of Federal funds--that Federal funds should be used as seed money.

One argument in support of giving LSCA III funds to MINITEX might be that the funds are relatively small and MINITEX has demonstrated that it manages projects well and delivers service and produces tangible results. However, the questions remain, "Is this the best use of Federal funds? Indeed, if used as it has been, how crucial is this amount of money to cooperation and networking in Minnesota?" The answers tend toward "no" and "not very."

Other questions arise that are not easily answered. Because MINITEX is able to attract research and demonstration funds other than from LSCA III and because the State now pays two-thirds of the cost for the participation of the public libraries and LSCA III funds pay only one-third, why not have the State pay the total cost? Because it has been stated that much remains to be done to achieve a statewide network and that MINITEX is only one component, why not use LSCA III funds for work on the other components? Is there not the expertise in Minnesota to begin work on the other components? Is $46,000 insufficient to get started? Does a plan exist for multitype library development or is money needed to develop plans?

Cooperation and networking are important in Minnesota, and there appears to be a real place for a Federal role in networking in Minnesota. However, further efforts in this direction are constrained by the limited amount of money available and the lack of any attempt to establish standards to ensure compatibility on a nationwide basis.

INTERLIBRARY COOPERATION AND NETWORKING: A CASE STUDY OF LSCA III AT THE STATE AND PROJECT LEVEL

State Visited: Mississippi

LSCA III Project Visited: Statewide Telephone and Teletype Reference Service

Period Studied: Fiscal Year 1976

1: INTRODUCTION

Since 1950, the underlying principle of the Mississippi Library Commission's activities has been the strengthening of library services to its patrons through the organizing of cooperatives and regional library systems. It has been well understood in Mississippi that, with the limited resources available to this State's system and the distance yet to travel in developing the system fully, cooperation and regional networking is crucial to success.

Almost a quarter of a century ago, 28 counties in Mississippi were without library services. Today all 28 counties have some form of library service. While the general view of Mississippi's library community is that this is a significant accomplishment, attention is called to the fact that the quality and quantity of services is still seriously lacking. As one of the individuals involved in the growth of the system commented:

> While we are proud of the phenomenal growth of library services in Mississippi in comparison to most of the Nation, we are still very much in our infancy.

The State has embraced fully the purposes of the LSCA III program, utilizing cooperatives and networks to meet its goal of maximum coverage of the population by libraries in the State. LSCA III monies have gone to fund a Statewide Telephone and Teletype Service, support of a Technical Processing Center, and various administrative support programs for these projects. The Statewide Telephone and Teletype Reference Service has been supported by LSCA III since 1967 and is currently the only project in the State receiving funds from LSCA III. This service has helped to propel the State to meet its goal of cooperation.

2: MANAGEMENT OF LSCA III AT THE STATE LEVEL

2.1: Needs Assessment

In Mississippi, needs assessment is an ongoing process of constant and productive communication between the State Library Agency (the

Mississippi Library Commission) and the library community of the State. Much of the needs assessment activity is informal, taking place as a matter of course in the daily interaction of Agency staff and local librarians. However, important formal studies have also taken place that include:

- *Better Library Service for Mississippi* published in 1975 by Dr. Charles Evans, commissioned by the Mississippi Library Association and the University of Mississippi. Utilizing an interview format, the Evans Study, which included all types of libraries and users, was not necessarily limited to LSCA Title III.

- *A Self Study/Evaluation of the Information Services Department* of the Mississippi Library Commission conducted by the Mississippi Library Commission and published in 1975. It "concentrated on the telephone/teletype reference service with only incidental attention to mail requests or state employee requests." Questionnaires were mailed to libraries and patrons, and their feedback had significant impact on the recommendations included in the final report.

- *Southeast Library Survey* published data on Mississippi libraries in 1974.

- *National Center for Education Statistics* conducts a statistical study every two years; the most recent findings on Mississippi libraries were published in 1976.

- *The Patron of the First Regional Library of Mississippi: His Needs, Desires and Recommendations Relating to the Public Library* by Lora Alcorn Long, published in 1972. Ms. Alcorn conducted this study while she was a doctoral candidate at the University of Mississippi. Although the study did not originate at the State level, its findings and recommendations have influenced planning and policymaking inside and outside the first regional system.

Most of the libraries which belong to the Statewide Telephone and Teletype Reference Service reported that the needs of patrons are usually communicated to the State Library Agency verbally in an informal manner. Verbal and written comments are solicited from the State's library administrators at Administrators' Conferences held twice yearly.

The conferences provide both an opportunity for interaction among key members of the library community and an establishment of a framework within which informal communication of feedback may occur frequently. An orientation session of LSCA for library administrators was also held. The State Library Association represents the professional interests of its members. The staff of the State Library Agency interacts with members of the Association formally and informally several times a year. The Association has regional chapters which meet frequently. The Association also has helped the State fund a Gallop-type poll of library patrons.

The State's LSCA Advisory Council meets twice a year. One of these meetings is used to analyze the State's library services. The outcome of this meeting is written up and published as a supplement to the long-range program in the form of a response to long-range goals and short-term objectives. Another method of needs assessment sometimes used by the State Library Agency is the review of proposals, which communicates areas that local libraries feel are important. However, the State is rarely able to fund any proposals. State Library Agency staff often informally review proposals prepared by local libraries for other funding sources as well.

As can be seen by the previous list, needs assessments in various forms are used quite extensively in planning at the State level in Mississippi. Because the State funds very few proposals, criteria for selection and funding allocations rarely require needs assessment input.

2.2: Defining LSCA III Objectives and Priorities

The State Librarian reported that Mississippi's objectives for its LSCA activities do not fully match those of LSCA III because "at the present time, we do not have our regional resource system [operational]." The original State plan for LSCA and the LSCA III objectives are not specific--they are considered by the Director to be too global. The five-year plan was not written to meet LSCA III objectives, but the LSCA III program is considered vital to the realization of important

State goals. Thus, they are not in conflict with one another. As the State Librarian put it, they treat "the same concept but are not stated in the same way."

The State Librarian felt that all of the documents (including State long-range programs, LSCA III regulations, interlibrary cooperation/network plans, results of needs assessment, etc.) used in setting LSCA III objectives were very useful. Considered of particular significance in the State is the publishing of the annual report of cooperation/network plans. The State has recently planned the reorganization of intertype library cooperative relationships statewide, expanding and formalizing them. After review by the Advisory Council, this plan will be incorporated into the State's long-range plan.

The fact that changes rarely occur in State LSCA III objectives was attributed by the State Librarian to the lack of sufficient funds. The needs assessment procedure is considered by the State Librarian to be the single most important factor that influences change in objectives. For example, the State Library Agency proposed to expand the State's telefacsimile transmission capability for interstate communications. While favoring that mode of communications, librarians in the State were reluctant to give up TWX equipment because interstate communications are often restricted to this latter mode. As a result of the librarians' strong opposition, the State Library Agency did not institute the change in machinery.

2.3: Policymaking at the State Level Relative to LSCA III

The members of the LSCA Advisory Council, along with the Librarian, and the LSCA III Program Coordinator are involved in all aspects of policymaking: needs assessment, the setting or priorities and objectives, and the determination of criteria for allocating LSCA III resources. By contrast, the USOE Regional Program Officer (RPO) takes part only in the setting of priorities and determination of criteria for allocation of resources. Libraries that are members of the Statewide Telephone and Teletype Reference Service and the planning and administrative staff of the State Library Agency assist in the assessing of needs and setting of priorities and objectives.

Needs assessment occurs twice a year as does the setting of priorities. All other policymaking occurs annually.

2.4: The Role of the LSCA Advisory Council and State Library Agency Personnel in LSCA

The LSCA Advisory Council convened twice in 1976 and was involved significantly in policymaking, giving budget advice, advising on the development of the State plan, and assisting in the evaluation of LSCA III programs, plans, and activities. They have direct impact on the process of matching needs with long-range programs.

The following personnel involved in Mississippi's LSCA III program spend the following percentage of time on LSCA III: State Librarian--30 percent; Assistant State Librarian (who serves as the LSCA I and LSCA III Cordinator)--40 percent; Assistant Director of Operations--30 percent; and Project Director for the project--30 percent.

2.5: Allocation of LSCA III Funds

The Statewide Telephone and Teletype Reference Service, which is the State Network in Mississippi and the only project to receive LSCA III funds, is part of the State's long-range plan. There are insufficient funds to consider other projects or proposals; therefore, soliciting proposals and distributing funds to individual libraries or for projects other than the network are not methods used by Mississippi in allocating LSCA III funds.

2.6: Budget Preparation and Controls

The primary responsibility for the preparation of the budget for Mississippi's LSCA III project rests with the State Librarian and the State LSCA III Coordinator. On a secondary level, the Assistant Directors for Library Operations and Library Development, the head of the State Business Office, and the administrative assistant to the State Librarian are involved in providing input. While the Advisory Council is not directly involved in the preparation of the budget, it has the right to challenge any budget items.

The predictability of State Library Agency funding varies by the source of funds. State funds, except for small increments have been fairly stable for the last five years. In addition, the State budget is prepared and approved a year in advance of spending so there is lead time. On the other hand, local funds depend on the tax base and the funding agency (municipality, county, or combination), and generally can be predicted a year in advance at best.

LSCA I allows projection a year in advance as does LSCA III, but other Federal funds, dependent on the submission and funding of proposals, cannot be planned for at all. The State Librarian commented that all planning in the State Library Agency is based on the concept of "What can you cut and still keep [the programs] going?"

The State Librarian felt that the mechanism by which the LSCA III budget is prepared is adequate because currently the State reviews proposed total funding for projects. However, new State policy to go into effect in Fiscal Year 1979 requires that all budgets be broken down by program-specific information. The State Librarian views this new policy with some reservation because, given the conservative traditions in the State, the approval of some program elements may be adversely affected.

The State Librarian has the final authority to approve the LSCA III Project budgets. No other individuals in the State approve the project budget on a line-item basis.

The Project Director of the LSCA III project in Mississippi is not generally involved in budget preparation; this is done by the supervisor to whom the Project Director reports. The State Librarian reported that, if the project were larger and had more funds, the input of the Project Director into budget decisionmaking might be sought.

2.7: Evaluation by the State Library Agency

Evaluations have a large impact on planning and policymaking activities and are incorporated into long range goals when these are updated annually. Evaluations of the LSCA III Project include survey, analysis of operations and needs assessments. Formal evaluations are conducted annually; informal studies occur monthly.

The LSCA III Coordinator has primary responsibility for conducting evaluations of the LSCA III project. The State Assistant Director for Operations and the Project Director have functional responsibility. One outside evaluation was conducted (Evans, 1975).

3: IMPACT AND USE OF FEDERAL AND STATE REQUIREMENTS AND CONTROLS ON LSCA III ACTIVITIES

3.1: LSCA Requirements/Controls

The LSCA III requirements were rated by respondents according to their usefulness. All of the planning and policymaking activities such as Annual Program, Basic State Plan, Project Reports, needs assessments, evaluation and the State Advisory Council were felt to be very useful, with the exception of the Five-Year State Plan. This was rated as useful, but considered time consuming. It was suggested that the plan allow an opportunity to indicate, in more areas, improvement of services in a similar manner to that currently used for bookcount [sic]. Preparation time of the Five-Year Plan usually takes three months because of the narrative portions now required. Mississippi staff recommended that if these segments were simplified, preparation time would be reduced.

Another problem noted with Federal requirements was that the Regional Program Officer often asked for revisions to required documents after submission. Because funds often hinge on approval of these documents, this revision cycle would cause the project's funds to be delayed. No reason was given for such actions by the RPO, nor was there an indication of how often it has occurred.

3.2: State Requirements/Controls

The Assistant Director of Library Operations and the Project Director employ both informal and formal methods of reporting to the State Library Agency. Formal meetings are held with the State Librarian, LSCA III State Coordinator, and other appropriate staff every six months. Informal meetings are held on a weekly basis. While a formal report is submitted annually, internal memoranda are written and circulated at irregular intervals. Formal oral reports are made to the Advisory Council once every six months. Informal oral reports are communicated on a monthly basis. All of these methods were rated by respondents as being very useful and productive.

Both the State LSCA III Coordinator and USOE Regional Program Officer had primary responsibility for monitoring of this project. However, it was reported that the RPO has not functioned in a monitoring capacity and project personnel have had no contact. Having designated the LSCA III State Coordinator as a primary project monitor, the State Librarian involvement is secondary.

4: USE OF LSCA III FUNDS BY THE STATE LIBRARY AGENCY

4.1: Types and Numbers of LSCA III Projects Funded

The following table presents the LSCA III Projects funded in Mississippi. Since 1972 there have been only two projects: the Statewide Telephone and Teletype Service, a continuous activity which received $45,160 in 1976, and the Mississippi Union List of Periodicals (MULP) which was funded for a total of $51,293. The Statewide Telephone and Teletype Service will be described in detail in section 12 of this report.

4.2: Products and Services Resulting from Availability of LSCA III Funds

The State Librarian attributed several products and services to the availability of Federal LSCA III funds and Federal emphasis on interlibrary cooperation and networking. The Statewide Telephone and Teletype Reference Service has provided for:

- Installation of four TWX terminals one in each of two colleges, one university and one in the Research and Development Center.
- Installation of a WATS line and an emergency collect call line in the Information Services Department of the Commission.

LSCA III PROJECTS FOR THE STATE OF MISSISSIPPI

YEAR	TITLE OF PROJECT	ADMINISTERING AGENCY	SOURCE OF FUNDS				USE		
			LSCA III	STATE	LOCAL	OTHER	SALARIES	EQUIPMENT	[illegible]
1969	1. Technical Processing Center	Mid-Mississippi Regional Library	$ 6,000		$ 6,000		$10,950		$ 1,050
	2. Statewide Telephone-Teletype Reference Service	Mississippi Library Commission	27,346	$51,928			44,767	$20,076	14,431
1970	1. Support of Technical Processing Center	Mid-Mississippi Regional Library	6,000		6,000		12,000		
	2. Support and Expansion of Statewide Telephone-Teletype Reference Service	Mississippi Library Commission	20,646	27,892			27,558	959	
	3. Technical Processing for Libraries of Different Types	(as above)	12,158	24,041			23,089	1,130	11,980
1971	1. Technical Processing for Libraries of Different Types	Mississippi Library Commission	14,505	33,413			34,726	694	
	2. Support of Statewide Teletype Reference Service	(as above)	22,894	18,157			20,720		20,331
	3. Administration of LSCA Title III	Mid-Mississippi Regional Library	4,529	10,358			12,928		1,959
1972	1. Support and Expansion of Statewide Telephone and Teletype Reference Service	Mississippi Library Commission	45,597	44,191			66,057	2,351	
1973	1. Support of Statewide Telephone and Teletype Reference Service	(as above)	46,559	63,277			72,806		37,030
1974	1. Support and Expansion of Statewide Telephone and Teletype Reference Service	(as above)	45,093	77,308			83,472	549	38,380
1975	1. Support and Expansion of Statewide Telephone and Teletype Reference Service	(as above)	45,160	109,920			101,523	8,953	44,604
1976	1. Support and Expansion of Statewide Telephone and Teletype Reference Service	(as above)	45,160	171,674			164,334	2,500	50,000

- Implementation of a centralized clearinghouse of requests. A specific number of libraries are polled via the WATS line for requests on a weekly basis. All libraries have access to the emergency imcoming collect call line and the Commission's holding and interlibrary loan service.
- Staff development as a result of LSCA funds is reflected in continuing education activities (i.e., workshops) sponsored by the State Library Agency.

The other project funded by LSCA III for one year only was the Mississippi Union List of Periodicals (MULP), the first comprehensive reference tool compiling the State's periodical holdings. MULP was published in 1974 and made available to all types of libraries in the State. The Federal funding was appropriated by LSCA III in 1973 and received by the State in 1974. Currently MULP is being updated and microfilmed with State-provided funds. State Library Agency's Research and Development Center has received $8,300. This amount, according to one respondent, will not cover the costs of updating, microfilming, and adding the holdings of three libraries not included in the original list. The Center will assume the additional costs. It was reported that Federal funds were not available to support the updating of MULP.

MULP was described by respondents as being "a godsend," "an invaluable reference tool in being able to provide better service to clients," and an "excellent example of how Federal funding can stimulate State support of a cooperative activity." There was no indication of how future updates of MULP would be funded.

4.3: Adequacy and Ratios of Funding Sources

Federal funds were rated by the State Librarian as being very inadequate. The cost of the project far exceeds the LSCA III funding available. In 1976, LSCA I funding totalled $584,281, while LSCA III funding was $45,160. The majority of the Mississippi library respondents favored a reversal of the LSCA I-LSCA III ratio. LSCA III is, according to one respondent, a drop in the bucket. The point was made, in several instances, that Mississippi's libraries have survived and grown, despite limited funding mainly because of the willingness to cooperate and share resources.

The State Librarian indicated that State funding of the LSCA III project provides monies in a three to one ratio with Federal dollars. While the State's share has increased dramatically in the past, it has reached a plateau recently and is not expected to rise significantly. State funding is currently seen by the State Librarian as adequate.

Local levels of funding are considered by the State Librarian to be fair considering the severe economic strain that plagues local communities.

4.4: Use of LSCA III Funds to Join Existing Cooperatives and Networks

At the State level as well as throughout the Mississippi Library Community, it was felt that LSCA III funds are to be used for any activities that promote interlibrary cooperation and networking. It is considered an effective use of Federal dollars to join existing networks and cooperatives because they act as an incentive to expand cooperative involvement because of the State's funding restrictions, lack of understanding of networking, and its inability to perceive its role as a networking sponsor.

4.5: Other Funds Used for Interlibrary Cooperation

During Fiscal Year 1976, Mississippi did not have projects conforming to LSCA III emphasis on interlibrary cooperation that were funded with LSCA I and/or other funds.

4.6: Restricted or Discontinued LSCA III Projects

There were no LSCA III projects hampered or discontinued due to lack of funds or other reasons. However, the Mississippi Union Catalog which was begun and completed with LSCA III funds is now being revised with the support of State funds because LSCA III funds were not available.

5: STATE MEMBERSHIP IN INTERSTATE COMPACTS AND MULTI-STATE NETWORKS

Mississippi has a cooperative relationship with Tennessee which is mandated by law. No funds are involved, and most of the cooperative activities occur between the First Regional Library System located in Hernando which borders Mississippi and Tennessee. In December 1977, Mississippi will become a member of SOLINET/OCLC (multi-state network) for the first time. It was not clear as to whether State or Federal funds will be used to support this membership. Also, the Washington County Public Library System would like to develop a formal cooperative agreement with Arkansas which is a border State.

6: INTERACTION BETWEEN THE STATE LIBRARY AGENCY AND LSCA III PROJECTS

The LSCA III project in Mississippi is the Statewide Telephone and Teletype Reference Service. This project is run as a part of the State Library Agency. As such, State Library Agency administrators are directly involved, not only in monitoring the project, but in managing the project as well.

Thus, while formal reports from the project to the State Library Agency are communicated twice yearly, the project actually reports informally on a weekly basis, with internal memoranda about specific issues being sent on an irregular *ad hoc* basis. In addition, there is a formal annual report and a monthly report to the LSCA Advisory Council. These reports are considered by State Library Agency staff to be very useful.

The only change desired by the Project Director in the State's management of the project would be for the State to support continuing education for the State's librarians.

7: STATE AND PROJECT LEVEL ASSESSMENT OF THE LSCA III PROGRAM MANAGEMENT AT THE FEDERAL LEVEL

7.1: Technical Assistance

The State Librarian felt that technical assistance from the USOE RPO was uneven at best, and negative in tone. "The RPO tells us what we can't do (with our funds) but does not initiate or support [our activities]" especially for LSCA III. The LSCA III Coordinator reported that the RPO provided review of written reports, conducted a site visit, and provided project management review, but only the latter activity was useful to the projects.

7.2: Monitoring of Projects

State and project level staff involved in Mississippi's LSCA III project all report minimal involvement of the USOE RPO. The LSCA III Coordinator's report indicated a lack of communication with the RPO although monitoring of the project is one of the RPO's primary responsibilities. The State Librarian rated the quality of monitoring activities as adequate. The LSCA III Project Director reported RPO involvement only in the approval of programs--not in the monitoring of the project.

There has been very little interaction between Federal and State, Regional and State, and Federal and Regional officials concerning local project activities. Federal officials communicate, if at all, via mail. The Regional Program Officer has demonstrated minimal interest in LSCA III project development in Mississippi. State administrators and knowledgeable project members view the RPO as being non-professional, non-supportive, and basically non-functional. Reportedly, the only interest of the RPO appears to be in LSCA I or II projects.

The State Library Agency has an excellent relationship with Mississippi's congressional representatives who are frequently consulted for assistance in problem solving. Periodically, the State Librarian visits Washington, D.C. on library business, but this contact with Federal library officials has been limited. The State Library Agency staff would welcome any opportunity to interact with Federal officials for the purpose of gaining a better understanding of Federal policies and plans vis-a-vis the future direction of LSCA in general and Title III in particular, and how they might impact on library development in Mississippi. Also, most of those interviewed expressed an interest in finding out whether the Federal government is committed to the development of a national network plan.

7.3: Dissemination of Information and Materials

Dissemination of information about Mississippi's LSCA III project has been accomplished through journal articles published every two years, annual publications of the State Library Agency, and monthly newsletters. (Packet, the regular newsletter of the Mississippi Library Commission, provides information about LSCA III activities as a matter of course.) On an irregular basis, Office of Libraries and Learning Resources (OLLR) disseminates some information. The State Library Agency and project staff are responsible for the preparation and dissemination of materials.

8: THE FEDERAL FUNDING FORMULA

8.1: Matching Versus Nonmatching of State and Federal Funds

The State Librarian is satisfied with the LSCA III nonmatching funding formula, but would be favorably inclined to a 50-50 matching program. The Mississippi respondents also favored an increase in Federal contributions of 100 percent. In addition, they would recommend a three-way contribution of equal size by local as well as State and Federal sources.

8.2: Impact of Increased Federal LSCA III Funds

If the amount of Federal LSCA III funds received by the State were tripled, they would be used to:

- establish regional resource centers for cooperative acquisitions to strengthen State resources and services;
- make available to the general public automated bibliographic search capabilities;
- establish an automated statewide circulation system to enable the public to make complete use of State resources;
- purchase telefacsimile equipment; and
- welcome proposals.

A detailed design of a regional resource system is in the process of being refined and approved by the State. If funds were available, the project administrators would require approximately two months to prepare for the operationalization of this plan. TWX terminals would be replaced by telefacsimile equipment because it is beleived that it will accelerate the speed and ensure greater accuracy in filling requests.

9: IMPACT OF LSCA III IN MISSISSIPPI

9.1: Development of LSCA III Projects Without Federal Funds

The State Librarian and the State LSCA III Coordinator reported that without LSCA III funds, the projects funded by that program would not have been started. The State Librarian expanded on this by stating that the projects might have come eventually, but would have been very slow in coming. "We would not have been where we are now without LSCA III."

9.2: Achievement of LSCA III Projects

The Statewide Telephone and Teletype Reference Service has, according to several respondents, "revolutionized library service in Mississippi." The State Librarian assessed the contribution of LSCA III projects in Mississippi as being excellent.

Prior to the receipt of LSCA III funds, Information Services of the State Library Agency functioned as the central processing center for interlibrary loan activities statewide. The U.S. Postal Service was the primary mode of communication between libraries in Mississippi. Dependency on the Postal Service resulted in delays in delivery and occasional loss and damage of valuable materials. All respondents described this system as extremely inefficient.

There is still some dependency on the mail to deliver materials, but the capability to transmit services via telephone and teletype and the opportunity for many librarians and libraries to participate in a centralized cooperative network outweigh, most agreed, any present shortcomings and disadvantages.

Achievements of the LSCA III Project are documented in comments made by the interviewees:

- Director of a county library located in the Delta region stated that "there are no disadvantages to being a member of the project. We borrow more material than we lend through this system. [We] could not have done without the access to Library Commission collection and university collections." The response from patrons has been very positive (i.e., "I didn't know you could do that").
- Director of a regional library system in northern Mississippi expressed pleasure with five orientation workshops where staff had the opportunity to develop a better awareness of the range of services available through project.
- Director of the county library system in the Delta region pointed out that interlibrary loan requests have tripled. "Without service, a lot of requests would go unanswered---we could not afford it---it would be impossible!"

9.3: Predictability of Funding and Its Impact on Cooperation

The inability to predict funding levels impacts strongly on planning and makes it extremely cautious in outlook. The State Librarian further explained that this caution prevents innovation and recommends that the Program provide provision for "forward funding."

10: STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES OF THE LSCA III PROGRAM

The State Librarian reflected on the strengths and weaknesses of the LSCA III Program. It was felt that the Program focused energies toward resource sharing and other cooperative activities and assisted in the delineation of resource weaknesses within Mississippi's library system. The State Librarian found the principal weaknesses of LSCA III to be the inadequate funding level and the interpretation of Program requirements in too restrictive a manner by the RPO.

11: FUTURE DIRECTIONS FOR USOE

There were many echoes by respondents of the State Librarian's comment that LSCA III should be considered a major priority in the future. It was further suggested by several individuals that the emphasis of the Program be on interlibrary cooperation, which is very important to Mississippi. Other recommendations for future directions included:

- funding for automated search capabilities;
- funding for a national network;
- funding increases for interstate systems;
- modifying program regulations so that LSCA I requirements paralleled LSCA III requirements; and
- funding on the basis of demonstrated need and relative impact of funds on the State in question.

12: A DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF A STATEWIDE TELEPHONE AND TELETYPE REFERENCE SERVICE

12.1: Services Offered by the Project

The Statewide Telephone and Teletype Reference Service has been the primary recipient of LSCA III funds in Mississippi since 1967, and few other projects in the State have been part of this program. This Service provides the following assistance for member libraries:

- resource sharing;
- centralized center for resource sharing;
- telecommunications system (3 TWX terminals, WATS line and emergency collect call number);
- continuing education; and
- preparation of Union catalogs and lists.

12.2: Funding Sources

In Fiscal Year 1976, the Statewide Telephone and Teletype Reference Service received $45,160 in LSCA III funds and $165,118 in Mississippi State funds. For Fiscal Year 1977, these amounts will be increased to $53,233 and $188,055, respectively.

12.3: Interaction with the State Library Agency

Because the LSCA III project is an integral part of the State Library Agency, interactions between the project and the State are more or less continual. Weekly meetings are held with management to appraise them of progress and problems, but interaction is daily.

12.4: Statewide Telephone and Teletype Reference Service Staffing

Mississippi's current LSCA III project is staffed by two full-time librarians and one full-time person as support staff paid for by LSCA III funds; and five full-time and one part-time librarian, one full-time professional, and eight full-time clerical and support workers paid for by funds other than LSCA III.

12.5: Role of the Project Advisory Council

In addition to the activities of the Advisory Council documented elsewhere in this report, the Council provided critical input into the design of the Long-Range Program published in 1972 which still functions as the "constitution" of the Mississippi library community. The membership of the Council as a collective group and as individuals maintain an intimate working knowledge of project and related library concerns statewide. Knowledgeable respondents indicated that the relationship between the Council, the State Library Agency, and the library community is a good one.

12.6: Problems

The major problems reported for the Statewide Telephone and Teletype Reference Project were lack of funding, lack of staff, and lack of materials. Lack of facilities was also a serious problem, and the lack of assurance of continued financial support and inappropriateness of facilities were seen as problems, although not as serious as others mentioned.

12.7: Evaluation of the LSCA III Project

The Mississippi State Library Agency and project staff place a high value on the process of evaluation especially because it provides information, such as that obtained in the needs assessment, that leads to improvement of services. Evaluations have shown the project to be considered successful by participants in the State Network, although the Project Director emphasized that success is relative. Because the expectations of participants were low and the budget limited, the Project Director felt the project was successful in obtaining its objectives.

The State Coordinator reported use of a wide variety of methods in conducting evaluation. Most activities were conducted in the last year, and all were considered very useful. These included:

- formal survey of libraries;
- informal feedback from library personnel;
- informal feedback from users;
- cost and statistical analysis;
- analysis of circulation records;
- analysis of access potential;
- analysis of user records;
- analysis of requests; and
- official meeting.

12.8: Impact

The Statewide Telephone and Teletype Reference Service is considered by most participants, its staff, and the State Library Agency to have had a significant impact on library services in Mississippi.

The problems of the project are a direct result of its success in demonstrating capability and efficiency in meeting the information needs of Mississippians. Prior to the implementation of the project, interlibrary loan and resource sharing was a slow, inefficient operation. Many believed that nothing much could be done to relieve the situation. Libraries were losing patrons and attracting few new ones. It was difficult to gain the support of citizens and politicians who had the power to decide the fate of libraries.

LSCA III funding provided the support that many libraries, especially the small libraries, needed to improve their services to their clients, to demonstrate their capability, and to repair and enhance their public image. Furthermore, for many, the project was the first opportunity to experience the process of an organized cooperative network and realize the benefits.

Several of the libraries, a State administrator pointed out, that initially chose not to become a member of the project have since joined because they have realized the benefits of the project in assisting to upgrade services to clients. Some feared that an increase in interlibrary loan activity would significantly deplete their collections to a point that services to their local clientele would be adversely affected. Most project members were quick to point out that they received more materials as a result of the project than they were able to give. On the other hand, respondents representing libraries with substantial collections (mostly college and university libraries) did indicate that they loaned more materials than they borrowed, but the availability of the teletype and WATS line afforded them the opportunity to locate resources in and out of State. One respondent who administers one of the largest libraries in Mississippi stated that "We have profited immensely from interlibrary cooperation. We are not dissatisfied because we give more than we borrow. Because we have substanial resources, we have a real responsibility to share our resources with all the residents of the State. The real benefit is to the State and user who is able to find materials there that don't exist elsewhere in Mississippi."

Only one respondent expressed concern that large collections were being strained through participation in the project. However, the same administrator who happens to be the director of a large special library did say that this library had not experienced any strain vis-a-vis its holdings or staff since joining the project. The respondent felt that much of the strain on large libraries would be relieved once the Mississippi Library Commission's proposed network plan is approved, funded, and implemented.

The problem of how to meet the demands and expectations of the rapidly growing patronage can only be solved by expansion. Expansion is translated by the library administrators and librarians into the need for more money in substantial amounts. Everyone interviewed validated that the survival and flourishing of libraries in Mississippi is dependent on additional funding. Everyone also agreed that without LSCA in general and Title III in particular, it would have been impossible for library development in Mississippi to have progressed to its current level of service.

12.9: Role of the Project in the State's Cooperative and Networking Efforts

The Statewide Telephone and Teletype Reference Service has been the cornerstone of Mississippi's efforts to develop resource sharing through networking and cooperative efforts in the State. The Mississippi State Library Agency, through its Reference Service, handles much of the statewide activities in these directions in addition to telecommunications. State Library Agency staff are committed to the concept of cooperation and increasing resource sharing. When discussing impact, successes, future directions, all respondents pointed to the State's role, and the impetus given this movement by the ability to provide services through the telecommunications project funded by LSCA III.

12.10: Project Relationships with other Library Cooperatives and Networks

The Statewide Telephone and Teletype Reference Service does not have any formal agreements with other cooperative networks or project. It is planned that Mississippi will join SOLINET (Southeastern Library Information Network), using LSCA I funds. There are informal relationships with cooperatives within Mississippi such as the Central Mississippi Library Council which is a State-funded consortium of libraries in the Jackson metropolitan area. This latter project accomplished an interlibrary cooperative program, Info-PASS, which allows patrons to use member library facilities. It is hoped by the State Library Agency that similar efforts can be ultimately accomplished statewide.

The State of Mississippi is mandated by law to maintain a cooperative agreement with Tennessee, but no funding supports any activities that might grow out of this agreement.

13: EVALUATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

In conclusion, all persons interviewed for this study expressed pride in the progress that library development has made in Mississippi. On the other hand, all of the interviewees said that there is still a lot of room for growth, and funding sources must be identified to support it. Reportedly, State funds are limited and most commented that, when library programs have to compete with education, public works, and social service programs in a State that has one of the lowest per capita incomes in the nation, an inadequate and unstable tax base, and a high unemployment rate, then libraries are not usually viewed by public officials as a funding priority. In addition, many public officials tend to align with a conservation tradition of reluctance to fund "innovative" and "experimental" library programs. The latter may be a clear indication that the library community needs to develop more information campaigns aimed at educating public officials about local and statewide library programs, plans, and needs.

Also, some respondents noted, Mississippi may have to reassess its tradition of relying on informal/verbal rather than formal/written communication modes. The thinking is that if library growth in Mississippi continues, existing programs expand and new projects begin, emphasis on informality may hamper the needs assessment, evaluation, planning, and decisionmaking processes.

Realizing that there needs to be more organized, formal contact with the citizens of Mississippi, State administrators said that plans are being made to develop a more informed constituency. Up to now, an administrator explained, logistical problems have limited such activities as public forums, meetings, and citizen orientation sessions around library issues from being held on a regular basis.

All of the interviewees indicated that the Agency's proposed network plan is the most promising sign that an official statewide system of cooperation and networking is on the horizon. If the plan is approved by the legislature, all stressed that the only possibility of full implementation would depend on extensive funding support from sources outside Mississippi. The Federal Government is viewed as being the best source capable of investing substanial sums in the development of libraries in Mississippi.

INTERLIBRARY COOPERATION AND NETWORKING: A CASE STUDY OF LSCA III AT THE STATE AND PROJECT LEVEL

State Visited: New Hampshire

LSCA III Project Visited: New Hampshire Statewide Teletype Network

Period Studied: Fiscal Year 1976

I: INTRODUCTION

New Hampshire, one of the smaller States, has 25 urban areas containing nearly 60 percent of the population. Yet only 16 of the libraries in these areas are in towns of over 10,000 population. These 16 provide area library service for 49 percent of the total State population while 14 percent of the population is served by 136 libraries in towns of less than 2,000 inhabitants. Legislation in 1963 led to the establishment of a single State library system--the Statewide Library Development Program--which now serves 182 of the 232 public libraries throughout the State.

The State's population is among the fastest growing in the Nation, and this growth is accounted for by predominantly young and middle-aged, white, highly skilled workers. The population is largely concentrated in the southern part of the State--the metropolitan areas of Nashua, Manchester, and Concord. Librarians in the northern-most areas of the State seem isolated from the mainstream, and perhaps it is unfortunate that none were included in this case study. However, the LSCA III project studied as part of this case study did not cover this region of the State.

Although the overall economic picture appears to be healthy, there are severe problems. The State Legislature's conservatism in funding is repeatedly cited. During the beginning of Fiscal Year 1978, the State was functioning without a budget because the Government had promised no new taxes. This was the situation in September 1977, with State agencies functioning on continuing resolution. New Hampshire is the only State in the country with no broad based income or State sales taxes. State revenues are drawn from so called "Sin Taxes." Educational opportunities allegedly are inadequate and there is a disproportionate distribution of jobs and income in the developing metropolitan areas. A relatively high proportion of the population has low incomes, often lower than other New England States and lower than the United States average. Directly applicable to this study is that support for town and city services is based mainly on local property taxes which in turn are based on low property values. In 1975 the per capita expenditures for all public libraries including Federal funds (except Durham) was $4.85. Most important, State monies have been relatively limited, and this will be explored in detail later. These have been the difficult conditions under which the libraries have operated.

Major developments, not always reaching fruition, in which member libraries have participated under a Statewide Library Development Program include:

- Centralized cataloging and card services on request also made available by contract to Maine and Vermont.
- Participatory planning by the four District Advisory Councils in the Program, composed of delegates from each member library, whose function is to make recommendations on library development to the State Library Commission. Current reaction to the importance of these Councils is rather unenthusiastic and seems to indicate that the Councils' role has dwindled.
- A Statewide common borrowers' card, although a few large public libraries do not have it, e.g., Nashua, Keene, Concord, because they believe that their budget should not cover services to users outside of their tax bases--non-tax contributors.
- Central resource services of Service Center Libraries. This project has designated larger libraries in certain areas to serve the smaller surrounding libraries. Interlibrary loan requests, etc. will be forwarded through the Service Centers which, if necessary, would forward them to the State Library. In practice, many small libraries seem reluctant to forego the process of directly routing requests to the State Library, and no firm policy statement has been issued.

All public libraries, whether members of the Statewide Library Development Program, do have the following services available:

- interlibrary loan services through the State network;
- reference and other services provided by the State Library Agency;
- statewide bookmobile services which are wholesale services to smaller libraries;

- film services of the North Country Libraries Film Cooperative which provides films to public libraries through a cooperative resource and service agreement with Maine and Vermont; and
- personnel development through the Public Library Techniques Program at the University of New Hampshire and extension services (member libraries have first priority for the latter service).

The Program has not been working in projects directly concerned with bibliographic control, which is the area of LSCA III coverage, but discussions and peripheral activities have made an indirect contribution to the information network.

Enrollment in the academic institutions more than doubled during 1962-1976, placing an increased strain upon the respective libraries. Dartmouth and the University of New Hampshire at Durham are net lenders rather than net borrowers in the State--they lend far, far more than they borrow. The New Hampshire College and University Council (NHCUC), or the Consortium, was established in 1966. It is an association of 13 four year, accredited, public and private colleges. The State Library holds associate membership in the Library Policy Committee of the NHCUC. These institutions share resources, plan for future shared programs, and to a certain extent, try to avoid duplication of spending.[1/] NHCUC maintains a four-times weekly truck delivery system. Several of the member libraries also are affiliated with NELINET (New England Library Information Network).

The State Library Agency is the organizational unit specifically responsible for interlibrary cooperation activities, and is the prime developer and mover of the New Hampshire Statewide Teletype Network, the Title III project under study. Public and academic libraries participate in the network, high schools to a lesser extent, and school libraries virtually not at all.

[1/] For example, they are developing a Union List of Serials in which the State Library is supposed to add its collection, but the State Library is behind schedule.

2: MANAGEMENT OF LSCA III AT THE STATE LEVEL

2.1: Needs Assessment

Several needs assessments have been prepared at strategic intervals during the history of LSCA III. A Plan for Library Cooperation in New Hampshire, Report to New Hampshire State Libraries was prepared by Arthur D. Little, Inc. (Little) in 1967. It was the original plan drawn up in response to the passage of LSCA III, IV-A, and IV-B. According to the State Librarian, its recommendations were followed closely. However, a point-by-point check reveals that several major items were not implemented; the key one, membership in a New England Library Network. NELINET was only starting then, but ten years later the proposal to join is still being discussed. At the time of the study's release, the present Project Director, then a library employee, took formal exception to several recommendations made by Little and also cited several points as inaccurate. A second significant study, A Study of the Interlibrary Loan System Presently in Use in Fourteen New Hampshire Libraries, (May 1, 1977) was done by Shirley Adamovich for the State Library and was made possible by the State Library Commission through LSCA III funds. Adamovich studied costs and efficiency in relation to cost of the interlibrary loan teletype system linking 14 libraries, with an eye to future terminal purchase. The study did not discuss the loan system and its effectiveness regarding patron demand and response. In August 1977, a library meeting was held to discuss the report and make recommendations. Because of the rapid technological advances in terminal technology, it was decided to wait a couple of years before purchasing communications equipment (present equipment is leased), or considering more sophisticated systems. Not all member librarians agree with this decision: a Nashua public librarian especially feels the State Library

Agency has been very slow in moving into this area. The librarian is so convinced of the usefulness of CRT's, that arrangements were made this year for a one week demonstration of a CRT and data base. The University Librarian for the University of New Hampshire at Durham believes that telefacsimiles offer advantages.

A third study, by Lowell Martin, funded by LSCA I, is in the final stages of preparation now. The Core Committee for a New Hampshire Governor's Conference on Libraries hired Dr. Martin to update the 1961 Study of Library Services in New Hampshire. The study is to provide suggested goals, guidelines, and a tentative plan for statewide library development in the State in the 1980s--the plan to be considered with citizens participating at a Governor's Conference on Libraries in 1978. All public libraries received self-appraisal forms and Dr. Martin visited 50 libraries of all types in the State, plus various library interest groups.[1] Another study on school and public library cooperation is in the final stages now.

2.2: Defining LSCA III Objectives and Priorities

The State Librarian is not the chief policymaking individual in the State, but is the chief administrative planning officer in the system who feeds input into the Advisory Council, as do others. The Council studies proposals, determines objectives, and recommends activities and policies to the State Library Commission, who then vetoes or acts upon the recommendations. The Commission is the most powerful body, but the Advisory Council in the last two years seems to have strengthened considerably due to new membership. The USOE Regional Program Officer also is very active in recommendations and guidelines.

The State Librarian believes that LSCA III objectives are matched perfectly by the State program. Member libraries, having their own interests, tend to advocate changes in the program in those areas, but basically support the program and emphatically support the New Hampshire Network. The State Librarian remarked that changes in the project through its history resulted from cost effective factors. The Five-Year Plan is written in very general, broad terms as contrasted with the specifics of the annual program. Therefore, over the years, objectives can be altered easily to reflect an ongoing review process and the financial situation. The annual program submitted to the Regional Program Officer at the beginning of the year is followed by an evaluation report at the end of the year.

---

[1] Creaghe, Norma "Dr. Lowell A. Martin is to Conduct Study of New Hampshire Libraries," the Council and State Library's, Granite State Libraries, vol. 13, No. 3, May 1977, p. 1.

2.3: Policymaking Relative to LSCA III

There is participation in the LSCA III policymaking processes by a relatively large number of people. More precisely, the individuals and groups designated by legislation to be active in forming library policy exercise that function. As mentioned, the State Librarian, as chief administrative officer, coordinates and supervises the activities of all divisions, recommends to the Advisory Council or directly to the Commission new policies, methods and programs, including those for grants-in-aid and instruction; and prepares, presents and administers library appropriations. The present State Librarian used to be Assistant Librarian, and nearly four years ago assumed the top post. The prior position has remained empty since then due to the lack of funds. The main question seems to be how important a role can be taken in policymaking if the legislature simply does not fund adequately. While library lobbying is not considered very effective, most librarians do not believe that stronger coalitions of interests would make the difference with such a conservative State government. One librarian did, however, indicate stronger leadership at the State Library level could make a difference. The other problem mentioned by member librarians is that although member meetings are held and ideas are discussed, consensus is infrequent, and impasses result; when compounded by low funding, little action is taken. This problem was also voiced by academic librarians.

The Advisory Council receives input from the State Librarian and member libraries and makes recommendations to the Commission. The six-member State Library Commission makes all necessary rules, regulations, and policies for the proper control and administration of the State Library Agency. It appoints the State Librarian and Assistant Librarian.

2.4: The Role of the LSCA Advisory Council and State Library Agency Personnel in LSCA III

Under the Library Services and Construction Act, the New Hampshire Advisory Council on Libraries has the following responsibilities:

- advise the State Agency on the development of the State plan, including the preparation of long-range and Annual Programs;
- advise the State Agency on policy matters arising in the administration of the State Plan; and
- assist the State Agency in evaluating library programs, services, and activities under the State Plan.

The Chairperson of the Advisory Council attends State Library Commission meetings on a regular invitational basis. The Regional Program Officer serves the Council in a consultant capacity as do four members of the State Library staff. The State Librarian ranked the Council as having key involvement in all areas of planning, policy forming, budget allocation, etc. Two of the academic librarians commented that only within the last few years has the Advisory Council been so influential, and that this is due to the personalities of some members.

2.5: Allocation of LSCA III Funds

The State ostensibly utilizes numerous methods for allocating LSCA III funds. According to the State Librarian, all review criteria are used equally for evaluating proposals, including a method for evaluating accountability. Past proposals from member libraries, for example, were often mentioned as having been turned down, and member librarians cited their disappointments over vetoed proposals. The proposals submitted by the Urban Libraries Council (comprised of the State's largest libraries) were the most often mentioned examples of proposals turned down by the State. Reasons for this were not apparent except that overall funds are so limited that the conclusion could be that funding is the basic problem. Several member librarians have taken active positions on proposals before the Advisory Council, so lack of involvement is not an issue in this State.

Allocations for the projects are not made directly to member libraries. They forward their bills for payment, e.g., TWX leasing, to the State Library which then pays for these services.

2.6: Budgetary Preparation and Control

In the preparation of budget and its control, the State Library Commission, Advisory Council, and State Librarian play the same active roles, with lesser participation by the member libraries. Because each library seems to set its own priorities, this tends to cancel out proposals made by others. The Commission either disapproves or approves the budget or policy request, which then goes to the Executive and Legislative branches for implementation of the political process. Ultimately, the Governor has the final authority, and the present office holder is viewed as a fiscal conservative. As mentioned already, the State was operating without a budget for the new Fiscal Year as late as September 1977. Both the Commission and Council solicit ideas for development from libraries and library interest groups throughout the State. The Project Director is not involved at all with the budgetary process, has little familiarity with matters at that level, and functions in essentially a supervisory role. The Project Director is involved with the mechanics of the Network Interlibrary Loan system.

An audit is performed by the Office of the Legislative Budget Assistant approximately every seven years. It was last done in Fiscal Year 1977 with only three or four minor recommendations, according to the State Librarian. The Advisory Council meets about once a month and closely monitors expenditures of the project. The State Legislature reviews the program biennially. Once every month a computer printout of expenditures is issued by the State Comptroller's Office. Other forms of budgetary management are ongoing.

2.7: Evaluation by the State Library Agency

The State Librarian submits a written annual evaluation of each project to the Regional Program Officer. Ongoing, informal evaluations are conducted by the State Library Commission, the Advisory Council at its 8-12 meetings per year, and the State Library Project Staff. The regular LSCA III required inputs--the Five Year State Program, the Annual Program, basic State Plan, and project reports are all considered very useful for planning purposes by the State Librarian.

3: IMPACT AND USE OF FEDERAL AND STATE REQUIREMENTS AND CONTROLS ON LSCA III ACTIVITIES

The CIPP evaluation and program planning model is used by the State Librarian, who is satisfied with its results. All of the LSCA requirements--the Five Year Plan, Annual Program, etc. are used and considered very useful by the State Librarian. New Hampshire complies with Federal and State requirements carefully, and finds that it is valuable as a review, monitoring, and evaluative process. It places high value on the role of the Advisory Council and the practices of needs assessments and evaluations.

4: USE OF LSCA III FUNDS BY THE STATE LIBRARY AGENCY

4.1: Types and Numbers of LSCA III Projects Funded

The following table presents the LSCA III projects funded from 1969 to 1976. With regard to the Fiscal Year under study, three projects were funded during Fiscal Year 1976 with LSCA III funds. Their emphasis was on bibliographic and communicative services and special projects for member libraries.

In the first project, funds expended for the New Hampshire Statewide Teletype Network were for the leasing of 14 teletypes, mainly used to conduct interlibrary loan. The project is the focal point of this study. Six thousand dollars in Federal funds were used;

LSCA III PROJECTS FOR THE STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

YEAR	TITLE OF PROJECT	ADMINISTERING AGENCY	SOURCE OF INCOME				USE		
			LSCA III	STATE	LOCAL	OTHER	SALARIES	EQUIPMENT	OTHER
1968	1. Statewide Interlibrary Loan Network	New Hampshire State Library	$40,454					$ 5,000	$35,454 (Contractual)
1969	1. Statewide Interlibrary Loan/Teletype Network	(as above)	39,844	$11,531	$32,817		$38,264	10,187	35,741 (Contractual)
1970	1. Expansion of TWX Network	(as above)	38,528	12,031	37,668		45,723	5,328	37,176 (Contractual)
1971	1. Expansion of TWX Network	(as above)	39,491	12,031	34,604		45,879	4,842	35,405 (Contractual)
	2. Administration/Inter-Library Loan	(as above)	2,547				2,547		
1972	1. Expansion of Union Catalog and TWX Network	(as above)	41,862				5,709	2,884	33,269
1973	1. Administration-Inter Interlibrary Loan	(as above)	3,221				3,221		
	2. Support of TWX Network	(as above)	14,900						14,900
	3. Interlibrary Loan, Compensation Grants to Resource Centers	(as above)	15,000						15,000
	4. Maintenance of Union Catalog	(as above)	6,363				6,229	134	
	5. Collaboration with New England Library Information Network (NELINET)	New England Library Information Network	1,890						1,890 (Contractual)
1974	1. Expansion and Support of Statewide Interlibrary Loan Network	New Hampshire State Library	36,714 11,842[1]				6,532	1,258 6,842[1]	28,924 5,000[1]
	2. Support of Interlibrary Cooperation-Teletype Network	(as above)	13,924						13,924
	3. Interlibrary Loan Compensation Grants to Resource Centers	(as above)	15,000						15,000
	4. Maintenance and Expansion of Union Catalog	(as above)	7,790				6,532	1,258	
	5. Interlibrary Cooperation-Availability of Materials (Microfilm)	(as above)	6,842					6,842	
	6. Collaboration with New England Library Board	New England Library Board	5,000[1]						5,000
	7. Expansion of Statewide Interlibrary Loan Network	New Hampshire State Library Agency	41,768				7,314		34,454 (Contractual)
1975	1. Maintenance of Union Catalog	New Hampshire State Library Agency	7,314				7,314		
	2. Collaboration with New England Library Board	New England Library Board	9,000						9,000
	3. Interlibrary Cooperation Projects	New Hampshire State Library Agency	25,454						25,454
1976	1. Statewide Teletype Network	(as above)	27,768	$98,622			48,737		49,385 (Contractual)
	2. Maintenance of Union Catalog	(as above)	11,912					11,912	
	3. Interlibrary Cooperation Projects	(as above)	3,350				3,350		

[1] Carryover from FY73.

$14,300 in State funds. In Fiscal Year 1974 the State first picked up partial funding of the network.[1]

In the second project, funds were used for Union Catalog maintenance. The State Library maintains a Union Card Catalog in drawer format only, of the non-fiction holdings of 40 large public and academic libraries. The salary of one clerk-typist who maintained the Union Catalog was part of the project. All requests for interlibrary loan were and are sent to the State Library for verification and then forwarded to the library holding the requested material. Dartmouth is not in the Union Catalog. Instead, it supplied a copy of its holdings on microfiche to the State Library in 1972. The catalog has not since been updated, and there are no definite plans to do so.[2]

The third LSCA III project involved grants for local level Interlibrary Cooperation. For this project $29,385 in LSCA III money[3] was expended. Grants were made available to local administering libraries to implement recommendations of the Working Committee on School and Public Library Cooperation in New Hampshire[4] and/or proposals for projects submitted by the New Hampshire College and University Library Committee, and/or intertype library cooperative projects from any other authorized body. The objectives of the projects are approximately the same--to promote communication and cooperation among all types of libraries; to avoid unnecessary duplication through increased cooperation; and to bring better services to all classes of users.

---

[1] Annual Program. New Hampshire Fiscal 1976.

[2] Ibid.

[3] LSCA III funds actually expended by the State differed from those reported in the Annual Plan submitted for Fiscal Year 1976. Hence the difference between the amount specified in the Table and the amount specified here.

[4] "A Statewide Program for School and Public Library Cooperation." The Working Committee on School and Public Library Cooperation in the State of New Hampshire; Bicentennial Edition, 1976.

4.2: Products and Services Resulting from the Availability of LSCA III Funds

Products resulting from the availability of LSCA III funds include the leasing of 14 TWX machines and completion of three special studies:

1. Adamovich, Shirley, "A Study of the Interlibrary Loan System presently in Use in Fourteen New Hampshire Libraries," New Hampshire State Library, May 1, 1977.
2. "A Plan for Library Cooperation in New Hampshire. Report to New Hampshire State Library." Arthur D. Little, September 1967.
3. A statewide program for school and public library cooperation and participation in regional cooperation projects. Workshops for the improvement and further development of interlibrary loan at local libraries, mainly public, were planned for Autumn 1977.

The State Librarian feels that academic library services are more than adequate already. The emphasis is on public libraries because the State Library Agency sees a greater need there.

4.3: Adequacy and Ratio of Funding Sources

Everyone agrees more money is needed, and nearly everyone recommends the Federal government as the logical source. Most librarians feel that the State simply won't come through with the funds, and that the libraries would be the first to suffer if the State were in financial trouble. The State Librarian was most articulate about recommending a funding formula as noted later.

Although there is widespread dissatisfaction with present funding, no one else hazarded suggestions. The consensus is that the State can't be counted on for adequate support; e.g., Nashua Public Library is nearly 100 percent funded by local taxes. Realizing that New Hampshire is without State income or sales tax, and that revenue is generated through "sin taxes," it is easy to understand why most New Hampshire librarians feel that loss of Federal funds would create severe setbacks. Individual funding of the TWX's alone would be very difficult, in the public libraries often impossible. Most recommendations by member librarians for increased expenditures tend to be low-key, perhaps reflecting, after years of financial struggle, scaled-down expectations.

4.4: Use of LSCA III Funds to Join Existing Cooperatives and Networks

The LSCA III funds have been used to join existing cooperatives. A few years ago the State Library Agency did have a form of affiliation or limited membership in NELINET (New England Library Information Network) but dropped out when the funding became difficult. Tentative plans now exist for the State to join NELINET with full membership, and the proposal probably will be included with the next biennial budget, As mentioned, the larger academic institutions in the State belong to NELINET already, through non-LSCA III funds, because of obvious cataloging and bibliographic verification needs. The librarian of the University of New Hampshire at Durham is one of NELINET's founders and considers that the State Library Agency has been slow to take this important step to membership. The Plymouth State College Librarian also has been active in NELINET leadership and has been a foremost promoter of NELINET membership within the State. Because the OCLC data base is becoming so crowded, very soon new members will not be allowed to have their collections put on-line. Therefore, the Plymouth State College Librarian has recommended that the State Library Agency discuss membership with NELINET now and try to make a "reservation" for full membership with the right to put the Union Catalog or key member holdings on-line. Thus, a spot might be "held" for New Hampshire. This librarian is concerned that if the State Library Agency does not even explore the possibility with NELINET now, by the time membership proposal goes before the Legislature in its biennial budget for Fiscal Year 1979, on-line membership will have been closed down and a major advantage of membership would have been lost.

4.5: Other Funds Used for Interlibrary Cooperatives

The State Library Agency has informal agreements with Vermont and Maine. One covers a circulating film library. Another provides that the New Hampshire State Library, in addition to supplying original card catalog sets for a fee to requesting libraries within the State, will provide these two other States with catalog cards for a charge. A Union List of Serials also exists among the three States.

The State Library Agency, with State funds, is experimenting with a truck delivery system to several member public and special libraries. If successful, this delivery system will be similar to the system used by the New Hampshire College and University Council.

4.6: Restricted or Discontinued LSCA III Projects

Resource grants to libraries were made between 1968 and 1973 with LSCA III funds, but were discontinued because of the unavailability of funds. No further information was available about these grants. Lack of funds was the only reason any projects have been discontinued.

5: STATE MEMBERSHIP IN INTERSTATE COMPACTS AND MULTI-STATE NETWORKS

The Legislature passed the Interstate Library Compact Statute in 1963. The agreements with Vermont and Maine and the proposed NELINET membership have been discussed already. Any other loan requests are directed to individual facilities, e.g., Library of Congress, and not to other interstate networks or cooperatives.

6: INTERACTION BETWEEN THE STATE LIBRARY AGENCY AND LSCA III PROJECTS

Although the State Library Agency has been given authority to advise and coordinate with local libraries, it has no involvement with local funding as it pertains to LSCA III. Member libraries provide substantial input into the LSCA Advisory Council and State Library Agency. Interaction between the State and the project is ongoing because the project is based in the State Library Agency.

7: STATE AND PROJECT LEVEL ASSESSMENT OF LSCA III PROGRAM MANAGEMENT AT THE FEDERAL LEVEL

7.1: Technical Assistance

The Regional Program Officer (RPO) is highly regarded by librarians throughout the State. The State Librarian considers this Officer's assistance invaluable in all categories of policy planning, monitoring, assistance and implementation. The RPO frequently forwards material to them and coordinates closely. The present individual has a library background and apparently is effective in working with the State Librarian and Advisory Council, although surprisingly, the Project Director has never conferred with the RPO at all. This seems to be a missed opportunity for assistance, and it was not determined whether it was deliberate, an oversight, or considered unnecessary.

7.2: Monitoring of Projects

Monitoring by the Regional Program Officer is of primary importance. Because the State Librarian is also the LSCA III coordinator, that role is considered of only secondary importance. The help from Washington, D.C. has been wanting, and the State Library always must request assistance.

7.3: Dissemination of Information and Materials

Dissemination activities are confined to intermittent articles in bimonthly issues of the State Library Newsletter, references in the State Library yearly publications, and infrequent or occasional trade/commercial publications and conference papers. There is also a yearly forwarding of entries to ERIC, as well as occasional news articles. This dissemination was accomplished primarily by the State Library and Project Staff.

8: THE FEDERAL FUNDING FORMULA

Funding difficulties in the State have been mentioned. Most member librarians were very negative about being able to count on the State for adequate financial support. With its low tax base, the State in past years has let the Federal Government fund many programs. However, in 1973-74 as a result of the Federal withholding of LSCA III appropriations, the State Legislature did pass legislation which appears as a footnote on each budget. In the event of unavailability of Federal money, the State will provide the anticipated amount with the understanding that money will be repaid if Federal money becomes available. This is what happened to the TWX project in Fiscal Year 1976.

At some local levels, e.g., St. Anselm's College, Keene Public Library, the librarians have, in the past, been able to budget money for the TWX project to cover themselves, but none has been required to use it for that purpose yet. However, recent rising costs in equipment and Western Union rates have now made such local funding attempts nearly impossible in the eyes of all but the largest facilities

8.1: Matching Versus Nonmatching of State and Federal Funds

No one sees matching of funds as a feasible solution to the funding problems. The conclusion now is that unless the Legislature changes its position on funding or librarians show absolutely inspired, influential leadership, the only thing matching funding would result in is less Federal funds. The State Library Agency does not use any local funds for local matching. Each locality determines and plans for their own funds. Interestingly, the State Librarian said that while the Legislature provides strong support in a moral sense, they cannot provide financial support. The implication throughout the State is that the present Governor is so fiscally conservative that he overshadows the milder form of conservatism in the Legislature. Substantial increases in Federal funds are requested. While no one wants matching funds required at the State level, the State Librarian believes that local government agencies should match LSCA III funds received from the State.

8.2: Impact of Increased Federal LSCA III Funds

The State Librarian recommends Federal funds should at least be increased to meet the minimum level as the law was originally enacted. The State Librarian recommends the following share of funding for LSCA III be adopted: Federal 50 percent, State 30 percent, and Local 20 percent. No member librarian felt informed enough to make a definite suggestion.

The State Librarian and Project Director expressed the need for a six months or less time frame for planning to begin spending if more money were forthcoming. The State Librarian feels that the Long-Range Program defines objectives and goals well enough so that in a six month period specific plans for implementation could be prepared.

9: IMPACT OF LSCA III IN NEW HAMPSHIRE

9.1: Development of LSCA III Projects Without Federal Funds

All librarians agree that the Network's impact has been considerable. The State Librarian believes that the Legislature has given strong moral support, even though the financial aid has been weak. The State Library Agency has been given authority to work with all libraries, and the Legislature has passed interstate library compact agreements and funded the majority of such things as teletype expenses.

The State Librarian believes that without LSCA III funds these projects would not have developed. "It's hard to sell new ideas." "It gives us seed money to demonstrate cooperatives." There have been a few projects in the State in which funding was possible from other grant sources, but they would not have been administered by the State Library. Most member libraries take an equally pessimistic view about the possibility of network development without LSCA III.

9.2: Achievement of LSCA III Projects

The LSCA III projects have achieved or surpassed their objectives according to the State Librarian. It should be noted that many of these projects have not been innovative but instead tend to concentrate on strengthening the State Library Agency as a focus for cooperative efforts.

9.3: Predictability of Funding and Impact on Cooperatives

According to the State Librarian, financial planning is conducted four to five years in advance for LSCA and State money. The predictability of the availability of funds has had a great impact. Given limited State funding, if a certain amount of Federal money was available on a regular basis more demonstration projects might be started.

If LSCA III funds were tripled, the State Librarian would implement the following:

- statewide truck delivery system--probably operating out of State Library;
- outgoing WATS and other improved communications;
- twenty-four hour reference service at State Library;

- automation of Union Catalog;
- full membership in NELINET for OCLC usage;
- greater funding of projects at interstate level;
- offer institutes and workshops such as the package institute from Michigan for continuing education;
- resource grants and cooperative acquisitions; and
- grants to libraries who lend more than they borrow.

After the recommendations by the Little study, compensation grants were made to three public and three academic libraries in the State that were net lenders. This was discontinued in 1975 due to lack of funds, and several of the larger libraries complained that some compensation should be provided. (NELINET is currently conducting research with HEA II-B Library Research and Demonstration Program funds to develop a computerized system to equalize lending loads.)

10: STRENGTHS AND SHORTCOMINGS OF THE LSCA III PROGRAM

The major strength of LSCA III is that it provides the incentive for developing Networks on a statewide and interstate basis. Its major weakness is that the program is under-funded.

11: FUTURE DIRECTIONS FOR USOE

The State librarians feel that the Federal Government must continue to offer funds, even increasing them, if the Network which represents LSCA III in New Hampshire is to continue. The State Librarians believe that there is no way the Network and other LSCA III projects can survive without this support. The State Librarians also emphasized how conveniently located, accessible, and valuable the Regional Program Officer has been.

12: DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF NEW HAMPSHIRE STATEWIDE TELETYPE NETWORK

12.1: Services Offered by the Project

The Statewide Library Development Program was begun in 1963. After the new ALA code for interlibrary loan was adopted nationally, a more liberal code for New Hampshire was drawn up based on the national code. Thirty-seven libraries, public and academic, ratified the New Hampshire code for interlibrary loan dated December 1969.

The State Library Agency is the organizational unit responsible for interlibrary cooperation activities and, within it, the Reference and Loan Division maintains the New Hampshire Statewide Teletype Network. The Director of the Reference and Loan Division also is the Project Director.

This LSCA III project, basically a continuation of an ongoing program (the State Library, historically, has served as the central reference resource of the State), is designed to improve the efficiency and speed of the already existing interlibrary loan system. The old system used mail and an outgoing WATS line from the State Library. Calls were placed to member libraries at certain scheduled times to receive requests. Today mass loan requests still are received by mail at the State Library. Although the Service Center concept has been in operation for nearly 17 years, many small libraries still tend to route requests directly by mail to the State Library. Fourteen teletype machines have been in operation since 1969. They are located at the State Library, Manchester City Library, Nashua Public, Keene Public, Baker Library at Dartmouth College, Plymouth State College Library, Franconia College Library, Laconia Public Library, Phillips Exeter Academy Library, University of New Hampshire Library, Dover Public Library, St. Anselm's College Library, New England College Library, and Dave Biomedical Library of Dartmouth College. The location of the teletypes are not permanently fixed and may be shifted as needs change. The TWX at Phillips Exeter Academy will be moved to another location as soon as the Academy feels it no longer needs the equipment. The State Librarian determines what library now has the greatest need. Few librarians see any need for more than 14 TWX's and feel any new equipment will be more sophisticated, e.g. CRT's.

During Fiscal Year 1976, 53,177 books, periodicals, and records were circulated; 13,460 books and articles were borrowed from other libraries via teletype, telephone, and correspondence, (the State Library Agency does not now have a WATS); 36,675 author/title requests were processed; and 9,585 reference questions were answered by the Staff of the Reference and Loan Division and the Law and Legislative Reference Division.

Several meetings of the teletype network libraries were held, resulting in the submission of a proposal to the New Hampshire Advisory Council on Libraries for an evaluation study, with recommendations that it be conducted by an outside consultant. A grant of $4,519 was awarded and the Adamovich study resulted. It was reported as a special project grant in the Fiscal Year 1975 report.

Copy machines were placed in larger libraries by the State Library to duplicate some materials rather than lend the original. One librarian expressed minor irritation that the machine had been placed without being asked if the need existed.

The "Triangle Plan" is an effort to speed up services. The requesting library sends its request to the State Library, which searches the Union Catalog, and if the copy is not in the State Library, forwards it to the holding library. It, in turn, mails the material directly to the requesting library rather than rerouting it through the State Library. Individuals can use the State Library, either in person with their Public Library card or with their Statewide Borrowers Card or can write to request material.

School libraries, although users of the Networks, still have not been incorporated fully into the system and their resources remain largely untapped. A study in progress addresses the problem.[1]

12.2: Funding Sources

State funds amounting to $14,200 were appropriated for teletype leasing, which were supplemented by $6,051 in LSCA III funds. However, since the State budget is footnoted to the effect that State funds are to be replaced with Federal funds if available, the result was that the total network costs were met with Federal funds.

---

[1] A Statewide Program for School and Public Library Cooperation. The Working Committee on School and Public Library Cooperation in the State of New Hampshire. Bicentennial Edition, 1976.

12.3: Interaction With the State Library Agency

The project is based in the State Library Agency, and hence there is no interaction in the conventional sense.

12.4: Project Staffing

The project is staffed with State Library Agency reference personnel.

12.5: Role of the Project Advisory Council

This project has no advisory council.

12.6: Problems

Among problems, funding remains the biggest. This problem has been so significant that it might be fir to say that among some public librarians and State Library Agency personnel there is a sense of resignation. Only limited development is possible. Leadership in the last four years has been low-key with no major plans proposed. The Academic libraries, while strong supporters of the Network, believe that the State Library Agency is strongly oriented toward public libraries with their more moderate needs and aims. In contrast, one member public librarian felt the TWX was a waste of money and supported returning to McBee cards.

Also, while there is local participation in planning at the State level through library meetings, a common complaint, especially among the academic librarians and the two largest public libraries was that very little is ever resolved. Issues are discussed "ad infinitum," but a consensus or resolution rarely is reached. With such a high number of librarians representing very small, distant, conservative communities with dissimilar needs and goals, the inabilities to please everyone and thus do nothing can create problems. Also, the Reference and Loan Division is working at capacity level to meet the increased interlibrary loan demand. Since so many librarians continue to forward requests directly to that library, either an increased staff or new rules probably will have to be implemented. It might be difficult to obtain funding for new staff members. Mention was made that for the first time in 20 years, a new slot in the State Library was recently authorized.

12.7: Evaluation of the LSCA III Project

At this juncture, evaluations of the project which is based in the State Library Agency are either recent or ongoing. The Adamovich study of May 1977 is most frequently cited as evidence of evaluation of this LSCA III project. It evaluated equipment and cost factors, not user satisfaction and system efficiency. The Project Director was disappointed that the study did not address these areas and had thought that it would. The Project Director's 1972 statistical breakdown of unfulfilled user interlibrary loan requests was a one-time attempt to analyze statistics and services. Although the State Librarian claims such a statistical analysis was last done in Fall 1975 or Spring 1976, no other report could be found. Most of the academic librarians and one large public library director (of a library not honoring the Statewide Borrowers Card) expressed reservations about some of the Adamovich findings in light of the *status quo* approach used.

12.8: Impact

The project is the main element in the cooperative/networking efforts of the State and will form the foundation for future expanded networking efforts.

13: EVALUATION AND CONCLUSIONS

The New Hampshire Statewide Teletype Network is composed of a group of libraries with librarians dedicated to improving user services. The apparent split between project objectives and needs of academic and public librarians is of moderate proportion. The academic institutions seem to have taken the progressive lead in developing and refining cooperatives and networking activities, to a great extent, because public libraries are less able to support such activities. Interestingly, some of the largest public libraries have refrained from honoring the Statewide Borrowers Card, one of the main features of the program. They participate fully in other parts of the program though. However, these large public libraries, e.g., Manchester, Nashua, have often moved ahead in developing or trying to develop their own regional cooperative activities and contemplate services outside of the scope of the State Library's activities to improve upon the Network.

New Hampshire is a highly conservative State politically and financially, and its libraries run the gamut from one of the largest, most scholarly university collections in the world--Dartmouth--to little more than small libraries open a few hours a day. The telecommunications Network consisting of 14 teletypes still is not serving the entire State. A high portion of request traffic is coming through the mail, the State Library Agency according to everyone is handling a tremendous work load, and many librarians evidently are reluctant to give up this cheap, direct method of Interlibrary Loan. Whether this pattern should or can be continued needs to be studied. Also, there is disagreement as to whether or not the teletypes remain the best means of telecommunications. Any decision to change the present method has been postponed for two years. Practically no one wants to see more teletypes. Some librarians feel that some of the present locations are ineffective and should be changed. The administration and management of the Network appear to be "democratic" with high participation levels. But the very high degree of input from member librarians has led to difficulties in reaching consensus as to the future of the Network. Some public libraries still remain disappointed with the nonapproval of their LSCA III proposals. Whether the fact that no Assistant State Librarian exists at present or that the Project Director is not involved in policy or planning explains the present state of affairs could not be determined.

The amazing diversity in New Hampshire is reflected in its libraries. Because of the above-mentioned points, and mainly its funding problems, New Hampshire is still developing its network. But it does conduct extensive continual planning and review processes, and the next two to three years should see the State Library reach some major decisions about the future direction of LSCA III in New Hampshire.

INTERLIBRARY COOPERATION AND NETWORKING: A CASE STUDY OF LSCA III AT THE STATE AND PROJECT LEVEL

State Visited: New York

LSCA III Project Visited: New York State Interlibrary Loan Program (NYSILL)

Period Studied: Fiscal Year 1976

1: INTRODUCTION

The goal of the New York State Library Agency as stated in 1970 in Library Service: A Statement of Policy and Proposed Action by the Regents of the University of the State of New York (1970) is that "any State resident, regardless of age, has a right to convenient free access to local libraries to meet his needs." New York State has within its jurisdiction one of the greatest arrays of major public, private, academic, and special libraries of any of the States and many foreign nations. In addition to being one of the most populous, urban States, it also has more institutions of higher education than most of the other 49 States. Thus, library resources are less of a problem for New York State than in many more rural and less developed States, and the State Library Agency has been able to concentrate more on enabling library users to access the resources available in the State.

The New York State Library Agency is situated in the State Department of Education which is part of the State University of New York. It is charged with the responsibility of implementing and administering the various plans and programs to develop library services and enable the State to meet its goals and objectives. Library development, within the constraints imposed by the economic characteristics of the State, has received comparatively high priority and funding from the State Legislature. As the Board of Regents has noted in the basic plan cited above, "Statewide library networks constitute the most efficient means to provide quality user service....[and] the central principle for a library program in New York State should be the further development of an integrated network of libraries..."

There are 712 public libraries organized into 22 public library systems, 249 academic libraries, 882 secondary school and numerous elementary school libraries, and a number of special libraries. The 22 public library systems are aligned, along with the academic and special libraries in the same geographic region, into nine Reference and Research Resource Councils (3Rs) which are designed to provide a mechanism to provide reference services within each of the nine regions. The New York State Interlibrary Loan (NYSILL) network, based in the State Library Agency, provides the cooperative linkage between each of the nine systems. This network is the means of linking all libraries in a hierarchical fashion and enables the sophisticated or special user to access any and all materials available in New York State. LSCA III has been used by the State Library Agency to improve and expand these networking efforts.

In the discussion which follows, LSCA III is examined as it has affected New York State. To amplify this study, NYSILL, which received all of New York State's LSCA III funds in Fiscal Year 1976, has been examined in greater detail.

2: MANAGEMENT OF LSCA III AT THE STATE LEVEL

2.1: Needs Assessment

The New York State Library Agency has depended on informal methods to conduct its needs assessment of conditions which would affect LSCA III type activities. These methods consist primarily of soliciting comments from the field, meeting with the State's Library Advisory Council, and conducting an annual systems conference attended by key members of 3Rs and NYSILL. One reason given for not using more formal approaches is that activities such as surveys are costly and cannot be supported by the State Library Agency. However, State Library Agency personnel do rate those needs assessment methods which they do use as moderately useful.

Personnel involved in the assessment of needs range from the State Librarian and State Library Agency Staff to network member library personnel. The USOE Regional Program Officer (RPO) was not involved in 1976 because there was no RPO during 1976.

The information which results from these needs assessment activities is used most extensively to support decisions made by the State Library Agency, assist in selecting projects for funding, and determine funding levels for those projects which are selected. These results are used only marginally to develop program objectives and are not used to assign priorities or to modify program objectives.

2.2: Defining LSCA III Objectives and Priorities

State objectives for its LSCA III program are thought to match Federal Program objectives perfectly. Operationally this means giving support to the State's Reference and Research Library Resource program and improving NYSILL, the State's interlibrary loan program. In this regard, LSCA III funds have been used to enhance these programs through the conduct of special studies. The net result is that the goal of making maximum use of existing resources is possible, and LSCA III provides a means for doing this.

In developing its LSCA III objectives, the State Library Agency utilizes its long-range plan, Federal Program regulations, and the results of its needs assessments. The use of long-range plans and Program regulations are thought to provide only marginal utility, while the results of the needs assessments are considered very useful. The objectives of the program are reviewed annually and seldom require modification. The reasons for this are that the limited but constant Federal contribution has little affect on the total State effort, and the projects are fairly well established and are working well.

In terms of assigning priorities to directions the program might take, New York tends to first ensure that ongoing programs operated by the State Library Agency receive the first consideration. Because of this, the State has attempted to provide special studies money for its public library system and reference resource system.

2.3: Policymaking at the State Level Relative to LSCA III

The development and review of policy affecting LSCA III takes place on an annual basis as part of the State Library Agency's general program review. At this time, personnel in the State Library Agency review results of any needs assessment statements, set program objectives and priorities, and determine how LSCA III will be allocated.

Personnel involved in this process are for the most part State Library Agency staff including the State Librarian, the State counterpart to an LSCA III Coordinator, and planning staff. These same personnel are involved in all aspects of policymaking. Involvement of personnel from member libraries is generally limited to the assessment of needs. In addition to reviewing needs, the LSCA Advisory Council is also involved in the setting of program priorities. There was no USOE Regional Program Officer during Fiscal Year 1976.

2.4: The Role of the LSCA State Advisory Council and State Library Agency Personnel in LSCA III

The LSCA State Advisory Council has a fairly broadly defined role in LSCA III, and State Library Agency personnel generally regard the impact of the Council as highly significant. The Council is involved in activities such as reviewing proposals and recommending policy, advising on budgetary matters, advising on the State plan, and reviewing LSCA III projects.

While one of New York State's two LSCA III projects is based outside the State Library Agency (3Rs), the NYSILL project is operated by the State Library Agency. And, as is noted in section 12, it is the later project which has received much of the State's LSCA III funds. Two persons in the State Library Agency have had primary involvement in the project--one as the coordinator and the other as the Principal Librarian in the State Library Agency's Reference Service Department. The State Librarian has a limited role in the day-to-day operation of the project, while the Chief Officers of the Bureau of Regional Library Services and Bureau of Special Library Services are somewhat more heavily involved.

2.5: Allocation of LSCA III Funds

New York State requires that its agencies categorize funds into one of two types, grants to local agencies and governments and "fiscal management funds" which are spent at the State level. Thus, the State Library Agency must assign LSCA III funds (and all other funds) for administration or for pass through to the local level. LSCA III is generally categorized as pass through and is targeted toward supporting the 3Rs reference systems or NYSILL. Thus, the allocation of LSCA III is in accordance with the Agency's plans for a statewide network or to support a State Library Agency program. The key criterion is that LSCA III be channeled into a program which benefits the entire State. One underlying rationale for this approach to allocating LSCA III is that because it constitutes a small amount of funds, by attempting to use these funds at the "State" level, maximum benefit is obtained.

2.6: Budget Preparation and Controls

Annual budgets for the LSCA III type projects are developed by State Library Agency Staff including the State Librarian, the Chief Officers of the two Bureaus having authority over LSCA III activities, and the Project Directors. Also, the Associate Commissioner for Cultural Education is involved at this stage. As a general rule, it is felt that the process used for preparation of the budget for LSCA III is very adequate primarily because the programmatic thrust of LSCA III is fairly simple and direct. The budget is approved by the Commissioner on Education and the Governor's Office. The budget is prepared and reviewed on an annual cycle.

Monitoring of expenditures also takes place on an annual basis and is the responsibility of personnel at the State Library Agency.

2.7: Evaluation by the State Library Agency

The State Library Agency used a wide range of informal and secondary methods to evaluate its LSCA III projects. Most of these efforts to evaluate the projects are used on an annual basis, and all are judged to be very useful. State Library Agency and project personnel are responsible for conducting these evaluations. Some of these methods include: analysis of usage, cost, and circulation data; and feedback from library personnel at participating libraries.

Evaluation efforts by the State Library Agency has tended to rely more heavily upon the opinion and reactions of the professional library community rather than patrons who utilize the Reference and Research Library Resources Systems (3Rs) or NYSILL, although NYSILL does keep somewhat detailed data on user characteristics.

3: IMPACT AND USE OF FEDERAL AND STATE REQUIREMENTS AND CONTROLS ON LSCA III ACTIVITIES

3.1: LSCA Requirements/Controls

The State Library Agency views the various LSCA requirements as generally useful with three exceptions. The Five-Year State Program, Annual Program, and Basic State Plan are highly regarded in terms of their usefulness to the State Library Agency, and no charges are sought to improve them. This same enthusiasm is also reflected in opinions about the emphasis on evaluation. It was pointed out, however, that if the emphasis on evaluation is to extend to actual evaluation studies, then some funding mechanism is needed.

State Library Agency personnel were less enthusiastic about the usefulness of three LSCA requirements: emphasis on needs assessment, the use of a State Advisory Council, and annual project reports. Needs assessment, like evaluation, presents problems because it tends to be treated as an administrative cost, and State agencies are under executive pressure to minimize costs or face budget cuts. The problem arising with the Advisory Council concept is that the membership, particularly lay membership, requires time to acquire the specialized knowledge needed to give serious consideration to policy issues, and that turnover negates the usefulness of the Council. The project reports were judged to be quite useless primarily because of the depth of information required.

3.2: State Requirements/Controls

The State government places no special requirement upon LSCA III programs and projects other than those of an administrative nature. The State Legislature has been very supportive of interlibrary cooperation as is demonstrated by the fact that inter-type library cooperation is authorized, and the State's share of support for the 3Rs program and NYSILL is considerable. The State has not involved itself in the development of LSCA III goals or monitoring of LSCA III projects.

While LSCA III has not resulted in specific changes in legislation affecting library cooperation and networking, the New York Board of Regents has recommended legislation that would authorize aid to the library service regions on the condition that all types of libraries in the region in effect co-sign an agreement to engage in cooperative activities. Ten million dollars is being requested to implement this legislative package should it be enacted.

4: USE OF LSCA III FUNDS BY THE STATE LIBRARY AGENCY

4.1: Types and Numbers of LSCA III Projects Funded

The following table presents a summary of projects funded by the State Library Agency between 1971 and 1976. As the table illustrates, the primary recipient of LSCA III funds has been the NYSILL interlibrary loan project, with some limited funding of the Reference and Research Library Resource System. However, as the table also demonstrates, LSCA III represents less than 25 percent of total budgets of these projects.

During 1976, LSCA III funds were used solely for the NYSILL project, although the State Library Agency had initially intended that the 3Rs project would also receive a small grant.

While the NYSILL project is discussed later in this report, it is important to provide a brief overview of the Reference and Research Library Resources System because it does represent a significant contribution to LSCA III type activities.

LSCA III PROJECTS FOR THE STATE OF NEW YORK, 1971-1976[1]

YEAR	TITLE OF PROJECTS	ADMINISTERING AGENCY	SOURCE OF FUNDS LSCA III	STATE	LOCAL	OTHER	USE SALARIES	EQUIPMENT	OTHERS
1971	1. Expansion and Improvement of New York State Interlibrary Loan Network (NYSILL)	New York State Education Department, Division of Library Development	$54,858	$753,472			$138,606	$305,500	$364,224 (contractual)
1972	1. Improvement of NYSILL	(as above)	85,008	395,090			59,899	575	419,624 (contractual)
1973	1. Reference and Research Libraries Resources System	(as above)	1,500	492,597					494,097 (contractual)
	2. Improvement of NYSILL	(as above)	92,320	374,850			66,494		400,676 (contractual)
1974	1. Improvement of NYSILL	(as above)	81,532	419,156			99,343		401,345 (contractual)
1975	1. Improvement of NYSILL	(as above)	79,317	480,822			57,054		503,085 (contractual)
	2. Reference and Research Library Resources System	(as above)	1,250	828,592					829,842 (contractual)
1976	1. Improvement of NYSILL	(as above)	79,317	569,921			57,051		588,186 (contractual) 3,698
	2. Reference and Research Library Resources System	(as above)	1,250	828,367					828,000 (contractual) 1,617

---

[1] Data for the period 1967-1970 was not available.

NOTE: Total funds received and total funds expended may not be equal due to the quality of the data available to the study.

The New York State Reference and Research Resources Program is a statewide program designed to serve the research community. The goal is to ensure speedy access to advanced research library materials for students and faculty in institutions of higher education, as well as for research workers in business and industry in the State. The program, widely known as the 3Rs, was inaugurated in 1966 by a legislative appropriation and is administered by the New York State Library Agency, Division of Library Development.

Nine reference and research library resources systems or councils cover the entire State. The 3Rs systems include a network of college, university, special, and public libraries. Given a particular regional supply/demand profile, the task confronting the 3Rs Council is to develop regional interlibrary loan policies and procedures, allocate available funding, and effectively match regional interlibrary loan requests to member libraries able and willing to fill the requests. Each 3R system is governed by an elected board of trustees; and though some librarians serve on the boards, lay people from the research community also are members. A system's boundaries must encompass a population of at least 750,000, or not less than 10,000 square miles, and a 3R system cannot divide an existing public library system. Membership in a 3R system is open to libraries of profit making institutions, although only non-profit institutions have voting rights. The dues structure is determined by each system to meet its needs. Each of the nine systems employs an executive director, staff, and has established headquarters.

These projects are closely linked with NYSILL because NYSILL acts as the next step in a hierarchical reference and interlibrary loan system and permits requests to be channeled through the State Library Agency to other Reference Resource Systems.

4.2: Products and Services Resulting from the Availability of of LSCA III Funds

As has been suggested, products and services which are a direct result of LSCA III funds are nonexistent because of the comparatively low level of funding LSCA III represents. The extent to which LSCA III has resulted in products or services is limited to the conduct of special studies and grants to explore the development of cross library union catalogs.

4.3: Adequacy and Ratios of Funding Sources

Of the three major funding sources--Federal, State, and local--State funds were judged most adequate in terms of cooperation and networking. Local funds are somewhat less adequate but are not crucial because the two projects the State operates primarily depend upon State funds. Federal funds are felt to be very inadequate. In general the Federal funds account for only about 25 percent of the total annual funding level of NYSILL, and the 3Rs program receives little or no Federal support.

4.4: Use of LSCA III Funds to Join Existing Cooperatives and Networks

The State Library Agency has not used LSCA III funds to join existing cooperatives and networks While it is not opposed to such activities, New York has concentrated its efforts on statewide development. The fact that New York contains some of the largest and most diverse libraries in the country may explain at least in part why the State has not had to "reach out" for such networks as OCLC.

4.5: Other Funds Used for Interlibrary Cooperation

Other than State and local funds, the New York State Library Agency has not utilized other funding sources to support its programs in intertype library cooperation and networking. It should be noted, however, that the grants to local systems made in 1973-74 required the localities to pick up funding for the bibliographic control projects started with the State grants.

4.6: Restricted or Discontinued LSCA III Projects

Only one area of inter-type library cooperation has been restricted because of the unavailability of funding. These projects, first funded by the State in 1973-74, were intended to provide a means of establishing bibliographic control. Local funding now supports such efforts, but it is clear that the State Library Agency would like to increase the level of such activities for the following reason. The State has developed a system to access materials and develop an inventory of all materials that would enable this three-part system to function smoothly. However, there were no reports of efforts to fund these expansion activities.

5: STATE MEMBERSHIP IN INTERSTATE COMPACTS AND MULTISTATE NETWORKS

At the present time New York does not belong to any interstate library compacts although there is at this time tentative consideration of a move in this direction. One reason for not joining in compacts is that New York has within its borders some of the largest and most diverse public, special, and academic libraries in the country. Also, membership in a compact would be expected to cause administrative and jurisdictional complications and might result in disproportionate use of library personnel in the State. Personnel in the State Library Agency did agree, however, that compacts to increase library resources and access to professional staff constitute a better use of funds.

While the State does participate in the Ohio College Library Center through its academic libraries and has used OCLC to verify and locate materials, it has not contracted with OCLC. There is no evidence to indicate that this pattern will change.

6: INTERACTION BETWEEN THE STATE LIBRARY AGENCY AND LSCA III PROJECTS

With the exception of a series of mini-grants to local systems to develop and improve union catalogs used by a number of constituent libraries (1974-75), New York has melded LSCA III with other funds and operated most of its projects at the State level. As a result, there has been little or no project-State interaction. State Library Agency and project staff do meet informally to discuss technical issues and formally to discuss fiscal matters. However, these meetings are intraorganizational.

7: STATE AND PROJECT LEVEL ASSESSMENT OF LSCA III PROGRAM MANAGEMENT AT THE FEDERAL LEVEL

7.1: Technical Assistance

Technical assistance provided by the USOE Regional Program Office is generally limited to reviewing reports submitted by the State Library Agency and participating in problem solving or brainstorming sessions. While this assistance is considered to be very useful, it has not resulted in any changes in LSCA III projects.

7.2: Monitoring of Projects

Federal involvement in the monitoring of projects is described as one of secondary responsibility. This may be due to the fact that during Fiscal Year 1976 there was no Regional Program Officer, and only subsequent to that time did the role become defined. Monitoring which did take place was judged as good.

7.3: Dissemination of Information and Materials

Dissemination of information at the Federal level is considered to be excellent, although dissemination of information on LSCA III projects in New York has been accomplished by personnel assigned to the project. In this regard, the NYSILL project staff attempts to use major Federal information clearinghouses such as ERIC.

8: THE FEDERAL FUNDING FORMULA

8.1: Matching Versus Nonmatching of State and Federal Funds

New York presents an interesting case where the State commitment to interlibrary cooperation far exceeds the Federal commitment. In Fiscal Year 1976, the State spent approximately $285,000 while LSCA

III funds totaled approximately $79,000. Thus, the notion of a match-requirement is somewhat of a moot point. Personnel in the State Library Agency did express satisfaction with nonmatching because matching would tend to act as a barrier to increased Federal funds. However, there was opposition to a requirement for overmatching and also to requirements that local agencies be required to match LSCA III grants made to them.

8.2: Impact of Increased Federal LSCA III Funds

There is a very definite interest in increasing the level of Federal funding for LSCA III. It was suggested that a threefold increase would be appropriate. Receiving equal stress was the need for forward or early funding to facilitate planning and implementation of LSCA III type activities and projects. Current funding is viewed as quite inadequate and is characterized as representing such a small percentage of the total need.

In order to bolster the development of interlibrary cooperation and networking, it is felt that all sources--Federal, State, and local--should increase their share of funding. The relative share should be 25 percent, 30 percent, and 50 percent respectively.

If Federal LSCA III funds were tripled, basically, the State would continue its current activity, e.g. NYSILL and expand it to reach more patrons. Key personnel involved in NYSILL also recommend that 1) additional planning be undertaken, 2) weaknesses of the project be corrected, and 3) the ability of the interlibrary loan system to respond be expanded through an increase in the number of reference libraries used as resource centers. Finally, if Federal funds were increased, the State Library Agency would favor implementing a program to increase bibliographic control thereby improving the ability of libraries to locate materials.

9: IMPACT OF LSCA III IN NEW YORK

9.1: Development of LSCA III Projects Without Federal Funds

Given the ratio of State/Federal funding and the programmatic direction of library development in New York State, it is evident that LSCA III has had a minor impact. LSCA III type projects were being developed, and LSCA III funds enabled the State Library Agency in essence, to complete and improve the projects. NYSILL is a State effort, for example, even though much of the State's LSCA III funds have been channeled to that project. As one person in the State Library Agency noted, the momentum was there, and the projects would have developed without LSCA III.

LSCA III has, as a result of certain of its requirements, tended to formalize linkages between the member libraries of cooperatives. This was evidenced when the State Library Agency made a series of grants to smaller cooperatives in 1974-75 to assist them in the development of cross-type library union cataloging.

9.2: Achievement of LSCA III Projects

When contrasted with smaller States, achievements and products resulting from LSCA III seem relatively limited. A primary reason for this is that much of New York's cooperative program had been established prior to passage of LSCA III. Thus, most LSCA III funds have gone into conducting special studies to improve the NYSILL interlibrary loan network. In addition, seven grants have been made to regional cooperatives. Thus, it can be said that while NYSILL, for example, has had an impact on its special groups of users, any improvements in this service are but an indirect result of LSCA III.

9.3: Predictability of Funding and Its Impact on Cooperatives

As suggested earlier, the fact that LSCA III funds may or may not be provided on a regular basis has no significant impact on

New York's program of inter-type library cooperation and networking. When programs are planned, there is no significant dependence on Federal funds. That is, Federal funds do not act as the core about which planning depends. However, whether this present status would change if LSCA III were measurably increased is not known.

When compared with other funding sources, LSCA III is one of the least dependable funding sources out done only by the short-range predictability of local and other Federal funds (such as impact monies for Appalachian regions of the State). The most predictable funds are LSCA I and to an even greater extent State funds.

10: STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES OF LSCA III

Perceptions of the strengths and weaknesses of LSCA III tend to concentrate more on the directions of the program than upon the Federal share in funding library cooperation and networking. This is what might be expected in a State such as New York when the State share in funds outstrips the Federal contribution. As seen from the perspective of the State Library Agency, LSCA III's two principal strengths are that it encourages libraries having close geographic proximity to cooperate, and that such regional cooperatives tend to relieve demand on libraries throughout the State to obtain materials already present in the region. These characterizations are in tune with the regionalized approach New York has taken to inter-type library cooperation. In keeping with this approach, one weakness of LSCA III is seen as the difficulty in determining the share of burden of the individual member libraries. A second weakness of LSCA III is the uncertainty that the States will receive funds from year to year.

In spite of the problems associated with LSCA III, it is important to note that the overriding positive aspect of LSCA III is that its funds have had an impact far greater than their simple dollar value. In the view of at least one person at the State Library Agency, LSCA III has made intrastate cooperation a reality, and that this should be followed by the development of interstate cooperation.

11: FUTURE DIRECTION FOR USOE

Two dominant themes are present in New York when the question of USOE's role in inter-type library cooperation and networking is raised. First, the level of funding of LSCA III must be increased substantially, although such increases must not be made at the expense of LSCA I. There is a very definite expectation among librarians that if LSCA III funds are increased that this would reflect a greater emphasis on inter-type library cooperation and networking. A second, related consideration is that cooperation and networking must become a key national priority. The assumption then is that high priority and increased funding will provide the framework for increased, more tangible impact.

A second area which USOE should consider is the development of a national network. Most of the suggestions revolve around interlibrary loan and the key actors in such a network. Personnel see the need for greater interjurisdictional networking. A very clear direction is that such a network must not be a new system but must make use of and take advantage of existing State systems. Some librarians suggested that the Library of Congress or OCLC under a new administrative structure might be appropriate. Also, some librarians suggested that the NYSILL approach might serve as the prototypical system. Whatever alternative, it would be the Federal role to provide the means for providing the interface between existing systems. Indeed one librarian suggested that networking must move in the direction of intersystems and not interstate.

It was observed that up until recently, USOE has involved the library community in determining future directions in only a limited fashion. Also, when compared with other Federal agencies--such as NCLIS or the Library of Congress--USOE has been an administrator not a planner and can be characterized as placing a "poor third" in defining the Federal role, in spite of the fact that USOE controls a significant source of Federal library funds.

12: A DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF NEW YORK STATE INTERLIBRARY LOAN PROJECT

New York State applied its Fiscal Year 1976 LSCA III grant to the task of improving interlibrary loan operations within the State. The New York State Interlibrary Loan (NYSILL) Project which is run by the Division of Library Development of the State Library Agency was the major recipient of LSCA III assistance. When NYSILL began in 1967, it represented the first time that State funds were used to reimburse major libraries giving specialized loan services thereby increasing the access to advanced reference and research materials of New Yorkers. Also for the first time, the State developed a regular contractual relationship among libraries in the State.

12.1: Services Offered by NYSILL

It is difficult and perhaps inappropriate to isolate those services offered because of LSCA III funds from those of NYSILL as a whole because LSCA III funds 1) represent only a small portion of the total NYSILL budget, and 2) are combined with State funds. NYSILL services to qualified researchers in New York include:

- access to advanced research materials in nine private collections;
- sophisticated bibliographic tools;
- telecommunications for processing loan requests; and
- an "urgent" referral system for certain medical requests.

New York State Networking for Interlibrary Loan System is designed on a hierarchical basis. The largest volume of interlibrary loan takes place at the local and regional levels. It is essential that local and regional resources are checked before a request is sent to the State Library Agency where NYSILL is housed. NYSILL in effect links the nine regions together. The system structure in New York State has made this kind of clearance effective, according to the Project Director, because the majority of requests pass through a public library or a bibliographic center. Only qualified users are served by NYSILL. These individuals are generally pursuing more advanced research. Thus, NYSILL is a research network filling special needs that local libraries cannot. As such, NYSILL provides the resources of the State Library as well as nine special and research libraries that are unavailable to the general public except through NYSILL.

NYSILL is connected to libraries across the State through a data-phone telecommunications network with access by teletype and occasionally, mail service. All requests first go to the State, never directly to the referral library.

12.2: Funding Sources

Traditionally, NYSILL has received the bulk of its support from the State. In Fiscal Year 1976, NYSILL received $284,307 in State funds and approximately $79,000 in LSCA III funds.

12.3: Interaction With the State Library Agency

NYSILL is a service of the State Library Agency. As such its interaction with the Agency is an internal, continuous process. NYSILL is a major priority of State Library Agency policy and receives adequate attention, funding, and review from Agency administration. The Project Director reported that he would like to see more interaction/communication with other components of the State Library Agency.

12.4: NYSILL Staffing

NYSILL and the Improvement Project are staffed with regular State Library Agency staff. As such LSCA III funds are used only incidentally to fund staff positions.

12.5: Role of the Project Advisory Council

The project has no Advisory Council per se. However, the LSCA Advisory Council was reported to have a significant role in the management of NYSILL's LSCA III project in the following areas: policy recommendation, budget advice, and evaluating the project activities. The Project Director reported that the working relationship between the project and the advisory panel was good, allowing good cooperation and constructive criticism through the interchange of ideas. The Advisory Council was also reported to be "committed to good library service."

12.6: Problems

Major problems encountered currently by the NYSILL Project are a lack of funds, lack of adequate staff, and uncertainty of funding. Other aspects of the project are reported to run smoothly, but several areas are recognized as being open to improvement, especially the urgent call service and general turnaround time for filling requests. In the past, NYSILL has not run as smoothly as it does currently.

In its first year of operation, requests took 22 days to be processed and cost $15.80 each. The project received 46,000 requests. By the following year, requests had increased to 87,000, unit cost had dropped to $10.82 each, but turnaround of each request dropped only 14 percent. Several problems still remained in the areas of record keeping and reporting.

NYSILL has been able to meet most of its objectives according to the Project Director, but it still needs work in the areas of current materials and access by elementary and secondary schools. Its rate of being able to fill requests, currently 60-80 percent, could also be improved according to the Project Director.

Another potential problem rests with the fact that NYSILL is set up for the user having very specialized requests. There is increasing pressure to make the project's services available to a wider range of patrons.

12.7: Evaluation by the LSCA III Project

NYSILL is evaluated frequently through informal feedback from member libraries and staff at regional meetings. On an annual basis, circulation, client access, usage, and requests are analyzed and reported in the State Library Agency journal, Bookmark. Periodically, studies are conducted by outside evaluators. At first Nelson Associates conducted yearly evaluations of NYSILL. After 1970, evaluations by outside consultants have been performed less frequently.

12.8: Impact

The impact of NYSILL as a whole, however, has meant a significant involvement by the State Library Agency in statewide and regional networks and interlibrary loan arrangements. Private collections are now available to eligible users, and State funds have extended interlibrary cooperation to a variety of libraries across the State.

Favorable comments received during evaluations related to the ability of clients to get materials they previously had not been able to get. Unfavorable comments regarded the turnaround time, and the fact that direct access to certain libraries has been curtailed. That is, before NYSILL, some clients had been able to go to the special libraries in person and get permission to use the facilities. Now, more often than not, they must go through NYSILL.

12.9: Role of the Project in the State's Cooperative and Networking Efforts

NYSILL represents the State Library Agency's primary effort in the establishment of an interlibrary loan network which ties all nine research and reference systems together. It appears fairly certain that NYSILL, along with the 3Rs, will provide a basic framework along with OCLC for any future efforts to expand into other cooperative activities such as acquisition, processing, etc.

12.10: Project Relationships With Other Library Cooperatives and Networks

Aside from its linkage with the 3Rs systems, NYSILL is currently studying the most effective means of interfacing with OCLC's interlibrary loan component which is now in the testing stages. In addition, NYSILL has had interface with the Regional Medical Library Program and the Center for Research Libraries. This latter cooperative effort was experimental and is not currently operational. In general, NYSILL has not sought extensive involvement in cooperatives and networks outside the State.

INTERLIBRARY COOPERATION AND NETWORKING: A CASE STUDY OF LSCA III AT THE STATE AND PROJECT LEVEL

State Visited:	North Dakota
LSCA III Project Visited:	North Dakota Network for Knowledge
Period Studied:	Fiscal Year 1976

1: INTRODUCTION

A State in which "no library... meets State or national standards" would seem to be an ideal candidate for emphasis on networks and interlibrary cooperatives. "One-third of North Dakota's population of 617,761 is without locally supported library service; one-third has public library service so inadequate that its contribution to local educational and cultural opportunities is minimal, and one-third has locally supported public library service of a reasonable, though nationally inadequate, level. The latter one-third of the population is located in the major cities."[1] Only four cities have a population of 30,000 or more, nine cities have a population of 5,000-20,000, and the rest are towns with 5,000 or less. Only 22 out of 53 counties support some level of public library service.

The State Library Agency has developed a program, using LSCA III funds, which tries to quickly reach and efficiently serve libraries of all sizes and residents not being served by public libraries. This project is the North Dakota Network for Knowledge, and for the past nine years LSCA III monies have been used primarily to pay salaries of State Library Agency employees active in the project. The Network is a statewide interlibrary loan system designed to supplement resources available to local libraries by offering bibliographic and communicative interlibrary services. Its main components are a central union catalog (print and audiovisual) of the largest libraries and a teletype/TWX, WATS, and mail linkage--potentially for all libraries in the State.

Repeatedly, there are references to a strong, conservative, predominantly rural element in the State, usually having negative implications as to expected levels of library support. Mention of this

---

[1] North Dakota State Plan for Library Development Fiscal 1977-1981, State Library Commission, Bismarck, May 1977. p. 23.

"political" base and the "politics" involved in funding attempts recurred throughout the interviews at all levels. However, North Dakota is one of the few States with a healthy surplus of money in the State coffers. It's important to note that the Union Catalog and basic Interlibrary Loan System already were in existence when LSCA III was first funded. This cooperative approach was described by the State Librarian as inherent in the "character of prairies." Indeed, the State Library motto is "Cooperation...a well known word in North Dakota. What we can't do alone, we do together." There is an expressed belief in the inevitability of cooperative development, regardless of Federal funding, although the grants are credited with speeding up the process. While there is very strong support for the Network and its services, Federal funding at the State and local levels raises some interesting, vocal, and strong opinions.

In conducting this study certain difficulties were encountered. The State Librarian, who was also the project director, confused LSCA I with III. The confusion occurred over and over again, and many conversations in the interviews had to be qualified by the insertion of LSCA I. This indicates the strong, conscious, and well-publicized impact LSCA I has had upon librarians (even member librarians had some difficulty). In fact, the State Librarian said that a study should be conducted on LSCA I.

Second, there is no Assistant State Librarian per se. Instead the Administrative Assistant for Fiscal Affairs and the Director (or Head) of Library Services fulfill those specialized activities. The Administrative Assistant sat in on much of the interview with the State Librarian and contributed a considerable amount of information.

Third, the member libraries selected for case study tended to be located in the eastern and central part of the State--the State Librarian claimed not selecting the sites and didn't know who did. The State Librarian felt (and later several library directors concurred) that different problems and needs exist in various areas, largely because of the demographic factors. The sparsely populated west is devoid of any large cities. The western economy is based on cattle raising, while the east and middle of the State is a farming economy. These factors have contributed to a unique self-sufficient character that may not readily perceive the need for library service beyond that offered by a reading room. Through questioning about the now defunct Williston project, it was decided to include that small northwestern library to lend greater balance to the study. Dickerson State College, also western in location, was added (at the State Librarian's recommendation) when the librarian at Minot State College could not be reached and that planned visit was "scrubbed." These problems should not be interpreted as reflecting negatively on North Dakota.

In this case study of LSCA III, the activities and opinions of State Library Agency and personnel associated with the North Dakota Network for Knowledge are presented.

2: MANAGEMENT OF LSCA AT THE STATE LEVEL

2.1: Needs Assessment

While North Dakota has not conducted any needs assessment activities directly related to LSCA III, the State Library Agency has engaged in a number of indirectly related activities most of which are informal. Two reports have been published and are discussed later in this report. Informal methods used to assess needs range from soliciting comments from the field and the State Advisory Council to conducting surveys. The State Librarian pointed to the fact that these needs assessment activities are pretty much restricted to public libraries and are not high-level sophisticated studies.

2.2: Defining LSCA III Objectives and Priorities

There has been a definite lack of formal planning at the State level. The State Librarian readily admits to these shortcomings in the LSCA III program. A heavy reliance on "instinctive, gut feeling" in determining needs and objectives is often necessary. While several studies of other phases of the overall State Library programs exist, LSCA III or Interlibrary Loan and Networking have not been assessed formally in the 1970s. The most specific and recent coverage of the subject was in 1967 and to a much lesser extent 1971.[1] The State Librarian blames this on a lack of staff and funds. Methods have been strictly informal, based upon ongoing feedback from members, usually through telephone calls, onsite visits by the State Librarian, and at the twice annual public librarians' meetings. There is no active and deliberate solicitation of member recommendations, however, and member libraries often cite their lack of direction and involvement in cooperative planning. Academic librarians believing that the State Library is strongly oriented toward public library needs have taken internal steps to advance their concept of cooperation.[2] The academic librarians indicate understanding of the State Library emphasis on public libraries. One reason for this State emphasis is the high number of non-MLS's or library science degree holders serving as public librarians. This gradually is changing, but it has led to workshops and meetings geared toward their training needs. Academic librarians in the State have more traditional "professional" credentials.

There is no plan or study showing specific steps to take if funds are substantially increased. The State Librarian firmly feels that current State objectives perfectly match the LSCA III objectives, and that no change has ever been needed. Yet, there is no well-defined planning for future new directions in programs representing considerable departures from the status quo, e.g., Ohio College Library Center. There are tentative, verbal plans, such as to increase the level of automation in the union catalog.

---

[1] "An Investigation of the Ideas on Interlibrary Cooperation in North Dakota." A Report presented to the North Dakota State Library Commission by Dennis Page (now Grand Forks Public Librarian) and Michael Miller, June 1967. "Reports of Regional Task Forces for Library Development, 1971." Vol. 1.

[2] Academic Library Planning in North Dakota. Draft Statement of the Long-Range Planning Committee for Academic Libraries. Edward S. Warner, Chairperson. September 11, 1975.

2.3: Policymaking Relative to LSCA III

The State Librarian has key policymaking responsibility and is active in all processes. Because the State Librarian is also the LSCA III Coordinator and Project Director, it is difficult to assess how the policymaking process would differ given a different person in each role. In the 1974 annual program, the hiring of a Project Director was projected, but it has been difficult to get the State Legislature to authorize and fund a new position. In the mail questionnaire, the State Librarian credits the Advisory Council with only slightly lesser responsibility--inactive only in actual allocation of resources. Reportedly, the Council has strong input in all other categories. However, the Administrative Assistant for Fiscal Affairs indicated that in the past the Council has been particularly stronger in LSCA I areas than LSCA III, although the State Library Agency is encouraging and trying to strengthen its role. From the member librarian it was learned that the current Council has not yet been reappointed by the Governor, with the implication that this might be a reflection on State Library leadership. However, this could not be verified. Another member librarian volunteered that the State Library had been effective in dealing with an often difficult government body. The two State Library employees, the Administrative Assistant for Fiscal Affairs and the Director of Library Services, together serve in the capacity of Assistant Librarian.

A basic State plan was written about eight years ago by the State Librarian when new to the office, whereas the Five-Year Plan is updated on a regular basis.

2.4: The Role of the LSCA Advisory Council and State Library Agency Personnel in LSCA III

There seems to be a discrepancy between the roles ascribed to the Council by the State Librarian on paper, what was expressed, and what actually exists. In response to the survey component of this study, the Council is shown as being a strong source of planning input, shares primary responsibility with the State Librarian, and is excluded only from the process of allocating funds. During interviews, the Council's strength was described in terms of non-LSCA III areas, although it is becoming stronger as its membership becomes more expert. A past problem was losing members as they became effective. In the State Librarian's opinion it takes at least a year to become familiar with the program, and the Council, like so many others, is familiar mainly with the heavily funded LSCA I. "Since LSCA I causes the State the most trouble and is more complex, most of the attention has been focused upon it." When compared to LSCA I, LSCA III is viewed as relatively smooth in its execution, and as a result, has gone largely without close attention.

A possible reflection of the Council's increasingly stronger role is its strongly worded reports to the Governor, dated February 2, 1976 and April 20, 1977. In the earlier report five areas of concern for further study were identified:

- access to adequate library resources;
- staffing to design and carry out library programs;
- physical facilities and equipment;
- coordinated planning; and
- financial support.

In December 1976 the Council passed a Resolution containing the following recommendations for the Governor's consideration.

- That a State Plan for comprehensive library services be formulated and that such a State Plan include objectives to more fully utilize the resources of all libraries in the State to better serve the total population.
- That the State Plan include a cooperative network for the delivery of services that will consolidate existing service, support the maintenance and improvement of existing library services, and as certain budget needs and sources of revenue are found, to implement the Plan.
- That the State Library coordinate and implement the State Plan as outlined by the State Library Commission in its recommendations to Budget Committee "C" of the North Dakota Legislative Council in response to the Fridley Report.
- That firm recommendations and implementation for such a delivery system be made to the Governor for the 1978-81 legislative session.
- With the approval of the Governor, the State Advisory Council on Libraries be continued to review and evaluate the progress of such a Plan.

Regarding Recommendation 1, the Council proposed three alternatives for management of the State-local relationship. These alternatives included:

- continuing the status quo in which no formal controls exist between State and local units; or establishing an intermediate unit, (Fridley plan) with local units receiving guidance and support, but not direct financial payments; or that
- giving direct dollars to the local libraries that in turn would form, fund, and control intermediate units meeting their own needs.

The Advisory Council's urging for a State Plan probably refers to the current State plan, written eight years ago by the State Librarian, which could now be considered out-of-date and too general.

2.5: Allocation of LSCA III Funds

The State Librarian is convinced that in order to effectively provide leadership and development of library service in North Dakota, all Federal funds must be channeled through one State Agency.[1] Allocations of LSCA III funds are determined by the State Library Agency, and the State Librarian believes that the Agency must take priority, especially since so little money has gone to the State Library. Concentrating the total amount of funds at the State level has a greater impact than when divided up among libraries or subjected to the political vagaries at the local level which may conflict with a State Library Agency plan. The State Library Agency does not actively solicit proposals from the field or individuals. In its report to the Governor dated April 20, 1977, the North Dakota Advisory Council on Libraries recommended that a State plan for providing library services to people of North Dakota can be formulated, especially as "no formal controls presently exist between State and local units."[2] Later sections discuss in detail this recommendation because it raises questions.

---

[1] North Dakota Annual Report of Expenditures of LSCA Funds for the Fiscal Period July 1, 1975 through September 30, 1976.

[2] "Report of the North Dakota Advisory Council on Libraries for 1967" Flickertale Newsletter, April 20, 1967.

2.6: Budget Preparation and Control

LSCA III funds are deposited in the State Treasury. The biennial method of State budgeting is considered by the State Librarian to be very stable. In advance of each budget period, the Executive Budget Office issues a memorandum indicating budgetary limitations. The State Library is a division of the Office of Director of Institutions. The Director of Institutions officially is the State Library Commissioner and legally has primary responsibility for budgetary formulations; in practice, however, the Director delegates it to the State Librarian. The State Librarian, working primarily with two chief assistants--the Administrative Officer for Fiscal Affairs and the Director of Library Services--draws up the budget, taking into consideration Advisory Council recommendations of how money is to be spent. The State Librarian generally asks for a larger amount to cover contingencies and, expecting a smaller amount will be appropriated, forwards the budget to the Director of Institutions who in turn forwards it upward. The Legislature authorizes and appropriates a smaller amount usually with the LSCA III amount built into the appropriated bill. The State will appropriate funds if Federal funds are not available, but with the understanding that the State funds must be replaced if and when the Federal money comes through. Because of this the State Librarian feels that "the State Library no longer is dependent upon the availability of Federal funds for its operation. State support of the operations of the State Library is more pronounced, largely because the Federal role in support of library service is considered uncertain. However, funding for the improvement or development of local public library service is still entirely dependent upon Federal library funds."[1/]

[1/] "Thirty-Fifth Report of the Director State Library Commission to the Governor and to the Director of Institutions for the Period Beginning July 1, 1973 and Ending June 30, 1975." Richard A. Wolfert. North Dakota Library Notes, V. 7, no. 1, January 1976.

Because the State Librarian feels that LSCA III money has almost no impact and the amount of the grant is built into the State appropriations as a safeguard device, questions arise about planning methods and possible uses for the $40,000 plus per year. On the one hand, the State Librarian is convinced that the conservative makeup of the Legislature and "politics" would prevent biennial funding of the money if Federal funds continue to be forthcoming (some member librarians agree). On the other hand, in the mail questionnaire it was stated that strong funding support is received from the Legislature. Does the ability of the legislature to fund $80,000 plus biennially or at least guarantee that amount pending Federal payment, show untapped potential and subsequent releasing of LSCA III monies for other uses?

The State Library Agency exercises budgetary control. A monthly report consisting of a computerized printout sheet (done through the State Accounting system for all government agencies) already shows all expenses. LSCA III has a separate account number. The Advisory Council, although involved (indirectly) in preparing the budget, does not currently review or monitor the budget. An annual State audit is conducted by the State Accounting Office.

2.7: Evaluation by the State Library Agency

As previously mentioned, no formal evaluation of the Network for Knowledge and its interlibrary services has been done except in terms of its being mentioned in Fridley's report. Ongoing informal feedback from library personnel at the twice-yearly workshops and, even more indirectly, user feedback constitute the main forms of evaluation by which the State Librarian determines the value of a predetermined objective. New projects are formulated at the State Library according to the State Librarian; however, interviews revealed that certain major projects, e.g., MINITEX, were proposed by the University Library of the University of North Dakota and a major public library in Grand Forks.

No formal surveys are conducted in North Dakota. A statistical analysis of circulation records was once planned and teletype records were kept for two years; but eventually the planned project, although worthy, was abandoned due to lack of adequate staff. Other than the listing of statistics in member's monthly reports and their accumulation and publication in the State Annual Report, no analysis is conducted. The Minot Public Librarian even questioned the general usefulness of statistical analysis--circulation rate does not show actual user rates.[1/] The State Librarian remarked that analysis of cost and usage statistics would indicate too high a cost, and would sink future funding attempts. Yet there is a belief that current, limited computer-based services are more efficient, thorough, and time conserving than former methods.

No one (other than the State Librarian) bearing responsibility for evaluations thinks that in the future, contracts will be used for LSCA III. This is currently being done for LSCA I and other aspects of the State's library program. Several librarians offered the comment that the State Librarian underestimates the quality of the librarians in North Dakota, referring to them collectively as unable to engage in such activities. They also believe that the State Librarian may underestimate the supportiveness of local communities.

3: IMPACT AND USE OF FEDERAL AND STATE REQUIREMENTS AND CONTROLS ON LSCA III ACTIVITIES

3.1: LSCA III Requirements/Controls

The State Librarian considers the Five-Year State Program and annual program as useless, and the basic State Plan as very useless. The State Librarian came on board in 1969 and wrote the basic State plan which has never received any comments. Additionally, comments were never received on the annual reports. As a result, they serve to give little, if any beneficial guidance in planning. The State Librarian believes people will take Federal money, without comment.

[1/] "Thirty-Fifth Report of the Director State Library Commission to the Governor and to the Director of Institutions for the Period Beginning July 1, 1973 and Ending June 30, 1975." Richard A. Wolfert. North Dakota Library Notes, V. 7, no. 1, January 1976.

if given. But if money is not forthcoming, they find they don't need it and don't clamor for it. This comment was echoed by several member librarians, and seems to reflect the attitude, of self-sufficiency in this part of the country.

The State Librarian does acknowledge the potential great usefulness of needs assessments, evaluations, etc. Interestingly, in this area the Advisory Council was rated as useless. When asked why, the State Librarian said "I value their input, but not their usefulness. They lack sophistication and dwell on LSCA I." Again, the emphasis is on LSCA I.

3.2: State Requirement/Controls

The basic opinion, from the State level to the member libraries, expressed about the adequacy of LSCA III funds is that a $40,000 plus grant is a "drop in the bucket" which makes serious planning difficult. Therefore, the emphasis is on using State funds, and LSCA III funds have not been promised for new projects or as seed money. This emphasis on the State level is reinforced by the State Legislature's provision of the last four years to guarantee State funds to cover any LSCA III funds withheld by the Federal government. In Fiscal Year 1976 the State government appropriated $253,353; LSCA I funds totaled $315,157; and LSCA III funds totaled $41,414. For Fiscal Year 1977 the State government appropriated $198,591; LSCA I funds totaled $337,304; and LSCA III totaled $43,606.

According to the State Librarian the State Legislature has been supportive in providing the State Library Agency with the necessary authority to work with all libraries. On this point, however, the Advisory Council disagreed in its report to the Governor dated April 20, 1977. It described "the necessity for the establishment of a division of Statewide planning, development, and coordination" and "that such control has not yet been granted to a State administrative agency." The Council cited the need for "an ongoing State Agency which has been given the responsibility as well as vested with the authority and resources to establish programs and procedures...," but recognizes that implementation soon is not likely.

The Legislature does not play an active role in monitoring projects. In 1973 when Federal funding was abruptly withheld, the State Legislature threatened to close down the State Library Agency by stopping funding. But local support rallied and changed the Legislature's decision. Out of this near disaster, the State Library emerged stronger in terms of State commitment, and trust in the Federal program eroded. "It has made liars of us" before the Legislature said one State Library employee, because the withholding of the funds seemed, unfairly, to reflect upon the quality of State Library budget planning.

4: USE OF LSCA III FUNDS BY THE STATE LIBRARY AGENCY

4.1: Types and Numbers of LSCA III Projects Funded

The following table presents information on projects funded under LSCA III between 1969 and 1976. In most instances these funds have been used by the State Library Agency and have not been distributed to individual libraries or regional systems.

In Fiscal Year 1976 one project, the North Dakota Network for Knowledge or the Interlibrary Communications and Loan System, was funded by LSCA III, with the bulk of those funds going for State Library Agency salaries.

4.2: Products and Services Resulting from the Availability of LSCA III Funds

Network staff salaries have received nearly all of the LSCA III money over the years. A few local grants were made in earlier years. Development has centered on the union catalog and improved communications linkage. Teletype and TWX equipment and an outgoing WATS line represent the projects communications linkages. Only one TWX, at the State Library, was funded through LSCA III. The rest were funded as follows: LSCA I funded nine TWPs and State money was used to fund three TWXs, and eight TWP's. The often-cited MINITEX program, which allowed borrowing of Minnesota resources, is not funded with LSCA III funds, but is a result of the Federal emphasis on interlibrary cooperation and networking. MINITEX funding will be discussed later.

LSCA III PROJECTS FOR THE STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA, 1969-1976

YEAR	TITLE OF PROJECT	ADMINISTERING AGENCY	SOURCE OF FUNDS				USE		
			LSCA III	STATE	LOCAL	OTHER	SALARIES	EQUIPMENT	OTHERS
1969	1. Technical Services	North Dakota State Library Commission	$ 3,000						$ 3,000
1970	1/								
1971	1. Minot Regional Library Services-Interlibrary Cooperation	North Dakota State Library Commission	30,000		$20,000		$12,500	$ 6,250	31,250
	2. North Dakota Network for Knowledge	(as above)	10,023	$20,476			24,060	1,740	4,699
1972	1. Coordination of Library Services	North Dakota State Library Commission	10,000				9,522		478
	2. North Dakota Network for Knowledge	(as above)	31,560				20,655	562	10,313
1973	2/								
1974	1. Coordination of multi-type Information Centers	North Dakota State Library Commission	31,408				25,639	265	5,504
1975	1. Interlibrary Cooperation	North Dakota State Library Commission	65,720	16,871			33,210		42,500 (contractual)
1976	1. Interlibrary Cooperation	(as above)	41,414	14,515					

1/ Data not available.

2/ Data not available.

Those State Library Agency employees paid with LSCA III funds are involved in the preparation of the COM catalog, a computerized microfiche listing of State Library holdings, which is distributed to member libraries. Two librarians, one new, found getting accustomed to the fiche format difficult.

4.3: Adequacy and Ratios of Funding Sources

Librarians at all levels agree that Federal funds are simply inadequate. The general feeling is that if not radically increased, these funds may as well be done away with at the State and local level. The State Librarian and several member librarians, particularly large public and academic librarians, view Federal money as being logically channeled for interstate networks and demonstration projects, and would prefer to see State money designated for State and regional network and cooperative projects. The forthcoming study by Palmour[1] will address the matter of State funding for academic libraries.

In 1974, 84 percent of public library support was from local tax funds, 13 percent from Federal funds administered by the State Library or from Federal revenue sharing funds, and three percent from all other sources such as the State Board of Higher Education which uses State funds for the support of MINITEX. No State funds are available for grants to local public libraries, in spite of the fact that the local tax bases are often very small. Discussion of local funds for State projects doesn't generate optimism, The main exception was one director of a large library who felt that viable library leadership at State and local levels could make the difference. The State

---

[1] Palmour, Vernon. Planning for the Future of Academic Libraries in North Dakota. North Dakota Post-Secondary Education Commission, Bismarck, August 1977.

Librarian's expectations about increased State funding are low. If librarians generally feel the Legislative and State governing forces are conservative to the detriment of libraries, they are more discouraged about possible local funding for statewide projects. Local property taxes and small levies support member libraries, but because there is a widespread unawareness among users of the network services per se, a public relations campaign is necessary. The average user is happy with the library, but is unaware of the network as a well-defined service. No user interviewed had borrowed books through interlibrary loan, although the North Dakota Network for Knowledge in its Annual Report shows that interlibrary loan requests and Network transactions have steadily increased from 6,192 in 1971 to 21,541 in 1975.[1]

The State Librarian was not optimistic about the possibility of local funds for State projects and, of course, emphasized the ongoing difficulties with State funding. In the field, librarians generally echoed these remarks, but showed more optimism. Striking examples exist of active, informed leadership, e.g., Grand Forks Public Library and the University of North Dakota-Grand Forks. Also, all library facilities visited were strikingly modern and fairly new with the exception of Dickerson Public Library, which is housed in an old Carnegie building.

4.4: Use of LSCA III Funds to Join Existing Cooperatives and Networks

No LSCA III funds have been used to join existing cooperatives or networks. Again, there is occasional mention of various interstate cooperatives, but the local level is unsure of what the State Library is planning in this area. The State level has not formulated any real plan and implies LSCA III funds are not reliable enough or adequate for the step, although the State Librarian and many of the member librarians believe Federal funds should be used for interstate and multistate service activities.

---

[1] These figures do not include requests sent directly from one library to another. Most requests are filled by the State Library or another library within the State, at a ratio of approximately 2 to 1. Moreover, libraries keep interlibrary loan statistics which are forwarded to the State Library in the form of summary reports.

4.5: Other Funds Used for Interlibrary Cooperation

In Fiscal Year 1976, MINITEX received 95 percent of its funding from the State (90% from the State Board of Higher Education institutional budget, which was not a line item appropriation). This is an experimental contractual program, instituted in 1972. The Long-Range Planning Committee for Academic Libraries was the impetus for this. The academic libraries are watching the development of MIDLNET (the Midwest Library Network) to determine if it would serve their interests to join. In the future, MINITEX will be measured against what MIDLNET offers. The remaining five percent was funded with LSCA I. MINITEX received $21,500. "Planning Date" was another project granted $1,000 of LSCA I money in Fiscal Year 1976. It is a computerized data base of library statistics and finances developed for purposes of annual evaluations and needs assessments of libraries.

4.6: Restricted or Discontinued LSCA III Projects

The Northwest Library Federation was established in June of 1968 under LSCA III. Termed an experiment in interlibrary cooperation, the primary purpose in its initial two-year experimental phase was to test the feasibility of the recommendations in a 1966 survey and to plan for the improvement and extension of public library service. This occurred through cooperative federations formed by voluntary contractual agreement among public libraries financed initially with State and Federal funds and later with a fair amount of local funds. Fifteen thousand dollars in LSCA III funds were spent during Fiscal Year 1971 on interlibrary loan activities as part of this project. Also it provided for four regional library resource centers to be developed at Bismarck, Fargo, Grand Forks, and Minot with Williston, Jamestown, and Dickinson designated as auxiliary centers. Minot and Bismarck were to lead off; Minot did, serving as a resource center for libraries, in a multi-county area.[1] Minot funded the project through a combination of local and Federal funds. This federation idea or regional concept was seen as the most economical and practical method of extending library services into the rural areas of the State. Funding for this feasibility study was ended at the conclusion of the report period, but the regional concept has retained a very strong hold on many member public librarians and functions very informally among all four large public libraries visited. These libraries view themselves as centers serving surrounding areas. Their concepts of service revolve around it, even as to whether outlying counties, often without any adequate library service, can be fairly charged user fees. Some local politicans feel strongly about not letting people living outside the local tax base use city services. In such cases, librarians may have to comply with local sentiments and policy.

Several studies have urged a regional or stronger sub-state development. Most notably, the Program Review of the North Dakota State Library Commission by Russell W. Fridley recommended the establishment of regional library service centers, functioning under contract with the State Library, to provide some of the services performed directly by the State Library. This development, Fridley thought, would permit the State Library to devote its resources more effectively in providing statewide library services beyond the scope and ability of local and regional library units. He estimated the annual program costs at approximately $620,000. The system would develop around eight urban centers--the largest cities. Upon release of the report, the State Librarian prepared a response directed to the Budget Committee "C" stating that "although we can concur with this recommendation as a concept and as a component of the long-range plan," present conditions do not exist to justify a regional service pattern now.

---

[1] Northwest Library Federation: A Report 1968-79, Sumner, 1970, p. 15.

Those conditions required are greater utilization of local resources, less dependency on the State for basic services, less duplication of services among all types of libraries, maintenance in the regions of the present level of services now provided by the State Library, benefits from regional services available to everyone in the State, and the relative cost to be greater than that for the same services under the present arrangement. Although in the Library Services and Construction Act, A History, the State Librarian calls for the development of more effective units of library service at the sub-State level,[1] it is not meant in the sense of formal library service centers. The State Library Agency clearly deemphasizes the regional or federation concept because the Agency's first priority in terms of expenditures is the State Library as the most direct, efficient tool for interlibrary service to the State. One of the leading University Librarians also came out strongly against regionalism and favors centralization in the State. This librarian suggests that a toll free number to the State Library and the Library acting as a clearinghouse, would cut the high fixed costs of supporting libraries.

A second discontinued project known as The Williston Project was funded for $10,000 in Fiscal Year 1972. Williston is a community with a population less than 12,000. It has a public library, junior college library, several public school libraries, and a county library serving the rural area through a bookmobile service. The project attempted to coordinate the services provided by the libraries of the University of North Dakota-Williston Center and the Williston Public Library and thereby serve the region. The two libraries were to be consolidated in one building and one administration. This supposedly would solve problems of a small, declining population, inadequate tax base, and the shortage of professional librarians. Most of the LSCA III funds went for the salary of a librarian to administer the college/ public library and to coordinate the services, on a cooperative basis, of the other libraries. The project was dropped due to lack of community support.

---

[1] Wolfert, Richard J. Library Services and Construction Act, a History of the Act, Use of the Funds in North Dakota, and a Glimpse at its Future for the Legislative Council. June 8, 1976, p. 12.

The State Librarian does not regret the discontinuation of these projects. If local support did not exist to provide continued funding, the State Library does not feel it should provide support. These individually funded, outlying projects are regarded as demonstration projects and Federal money as seed funds. The Williston Public Librarian, not working there during the period of the project, agrees with the idea that the local community must provide support if a project is to continue.

5: STATE MEMBERSHIP IN INTERSTATE COMPACTS AND MULTI-STATE NETWORKS

Membership in MINITEX is currently ongoing on an experimental contractual basis. This provides North Dakota access to the library resources of Minnesota through a State Library Agency contract with the Minnesota Higher Education Coordination Commission. Librarians at the University of North Dakota at Grand Parks called MINITEX the best thing that ever happened to us "as a small State." The Long-Range Planning Committee for Academic Libraries was responsible for initiating MINITEX in the State. Although Academic Librarians believe their relationship with the Network for Knowledge is "marginal," they still urged membership with MINITEX through the State Library because they appreciate the overall State need.

Although all librarians express immediate familiarity with MINITEX, some members express reservations. Some members complained about the State Library Agency requirement for complete verification of a request, although the smaller libraries might not have the necessary bibliographic tools. They felt the State Library Agency should be responsible for providing documentation where insufficient search holdings existed, and not to return the incomplete request forms to the local libraries. However, contradicting this complaint, some member libraries said complete verification was not required, and the State Library was accommodating in this respect. This indicates poor communication between the State Library Agency and member libraries about request formats. Possibly, inconsistencies exist among various State Library staff regarding the requested policy. Because enough uncertainties about the rules of MINITEX exist among members, publicity and clarification are required.

Large libraries and the State Library mention OCLC as being a desirable service for cataloging and bibliographic verification, but no definite plans exist now for the State Library to go on-line with OCLC. The large universities in the State currently have contracts with OCLC. The State once belonged briefly to the Bibliographic Center for Research in Denver, but dropped out because its service was considered too expensive and not pertinent for its needs. This feeling still is widespread. Through the North Dakota Network for Knowledge, material is borrowed from other libraries in surrounding States, e.g., Linda-Halle Library in Kansas City, but no formal membership agreements exist.

6: INTERACTION BETWEEN THE STATE LIBRARY AGENCY AND LSCA III PROJECTS

This project is based in the State Library Agency and as such, does not require interaction of the type to be addressed by this section. However, a project report rated as very useful is the monthly computerized statistical report. This serves as a guide and shows objectives and activities and their status. Other than these reports, nothing of a formal nature exists.

7: STATE AND PROJECT LEVEL ASSESSMENT OF LSCA III PROGRAM MANAGEMENT AT THE FEDERAL ROLE

7.1: Technical Assistance

Technical assistance from the Federal Government has not been valuable. The Regional Program Officer lacks subject knowledge and the Washington, D.C. office lacks time. Therefore in the opinion of North Dakota librarians, not much technical assistance is provided. The State Library Agency believes it must be self-reliant in planning, allocating funds, monitoring, etc., rather than looking to the Federal Government for substantial help.

7.2: Monitoring of Projects

The State Library regards monitoring at the regional level as a rubber stamp. The RPO is a "nice fellow," but lacks the knowledge of the subject. Because communication with Washington, D.C. is so limited, North Dakota does not regard it as a monitoring device.

7.3: Dissemination of Information and Materials

Dissemination of information from the Federal level is minimal.

8: THE FEDERAL FUNDING FORMULA

8.1: Matching Versus Nonmatching of State and Federal Funds

This subject elicited strong, independent opinions. No one seems to rely or indeed wants to rely on Federal funds to support the networks, nor does anyone want matching requirements. Federal funds are not recognized as the answer and are simply too small an amount (especially in the face of inflation) to have an impact other than as the initial catalyst. One commonly heard recommendation was that if funding levels are to remain the same, then Federal funds should be used for membership in interstate networks and for development and improvement of the resources in the pivotal, lending collections. This withdrawal of Federal money for intrastate projects would force responsibility for State and local projects on their own shoulders and perhaps force unified public support. The member librarians believe that current networking and any additional efforts should be funded by the State Legislature but require concerned leadership and lobbying. Indeed, "successful demonstrations have generated 'new local funds for public library services,' increasing from $318,000 in 1957 to $1,500,000 in 1975, while funds for the State Library Commision have grown only from $39,000 in 1957 to $97,000 in 1975."[1/] "No State is so poor it

---

[1/] Library Services and Construction Act, Richard Wolfert. June 8, 1976.

can't come up with the equivalent of LSCA III amounts," thereby shifting the funding of State networks to the State level. The State Librarian felt that member librarians would disagree with this. Actual interviews proved otherwise. Librarians feel that Federal funds are not only ineffective at local levels, but often are counter effective because of the dependency they create. Local librarians don't see a grant system to States as workable unless much more is appropriated to really make a concrete difference. The State Librarian summarized this by saying that the Federal government should "put more [funds] in or get out [stop the program]."

8.2: Impact of Increased Federal LSCA III Funds

Whether or not a sizable increase in funds would substantially or quickly alter services and products is a moot point. The State Librarian feels it would not. The State needs are developing carefully and solidly, a rapid large transfusion of money would go beyond present needs, and certainly no concrete long-range formal plans exist for rapid changes or improvements in products and services.

In the History of the LSCA prepared by the State Librarian it is indicated that "the States have been reluctant to accept the Federal legislative intent and that LSCA III is a demonstration program, not an operational subsidy program." However, because LSCA III allocations are determined in North Dakota at the State Library Agency level, responsibility would seem to rest with that Agency for uses made of the funds. LSCA III has improved services better than expected over the years simply through the speed of its accomplishments, often outstripping projections. Formal planning, already minimal, would take at least one year to develop courses of action. But, it is important to bear in mind (and discussed later), basic groundwork is strongly there and further along than in some States. For example, the union catalog is on a computer base for State level usage, and on fiche for distribution to member libraries. There are tentative remarks about the desirability of increased automation of the union catalog and money in terms of coverages of content and distribution to member libraries.

The other frequently mentioned idea is more on-line communications linkage via TWX or TWP among smaller facilities. The latter certainly could be effected quickly and possibly that explains the lack of urgency in developing plans for such programs.

Attempts to combine school and public libraries in smaller towns and thereby maximize trained help, resources, and facilities at the most economical cost have largely failed.

9: IMPACT OF LSCA III IN NORTH DAKOTA

9.1: Development of LSCA III Type Projects Without Federal Funding

Without LSCA III funds, the North Dakota Network for Knowledge would have developed, but at a slower space. The basic elements were in place for the project; the union catalog and most of the teletypes were added with non-LSCA III funds. More recent developments, e.g., COM Catalog and MINITEX have been supported almost completely by non-LSCA III funds. Because LSCA I dominates so much of the local funding activity, North Dakota would have to seriously reevaluate its programs and funding mechanisms if those funds were withdrawn. LSCA III legislation has largely acted as a catalyst. It has given the State Library Agency, in a very conservative, sparsely populated, agricultural State, the means to go to the Legislature with requests for a cooperative networking program. Although Federal assistance is regarded as a mixed blessing here, LSCA III does define the need for networks as important and that provides a good psychological tool for the State Library Agency. Unfortunately, the small appropriations (one year money was withheld) have had negative impact upon the Legislature; but by the mid 1970's local support has been so great for the program, that the Network now is strongly entrenched. Whether the State Library could get still greater financial backing by the Legislature is another question.

9.2: Predictability of Funding and Its Impact on Cooperatives

The predictability of available funds and its impact on cooperatives has been discussed in other sections. Basically, the State

Library Agency does not put much trust in the receipt of LSCA III funds; and if received, the amount is so small that the Agency perhaps deliberately puts most of the money in salaries, an amount which the Legislature has agreed to cover. The State Agency probably finds salaries easier to justify to the Legislature then new, untried programs. The indefinite status of LSCA III has made planning difficult. The State Librarian has stated that if LSCA III grants are going to be made, the amount should be radically increased--500 percent was given to dramatize this point. Yet elsewhere the feeling was expressed that even if funds were increased appreciably and rapidly, the State might not have viable ways to use it. The State Librarian does not believe that sophisticated technology is the answer to everything, and wants to proceed in measured terms. Bringing the North Dakota Network for Knowledge to its present widely supported stage overcame conservatism, untrained personnel, and resistance against change. At this point it might be appropriate to contract for an evaluation of needs assessment to determine future directions.

10: STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES OF THE LSCA III PROGRAM

The strengths and weaknesses of LSCA III as expressed by the State Librarian are quite succinct. The program's objectives and regulations are its strong points. However, as is noted repeatedly, the program is underfunded, and there is very little predictiveness as to when the States will receive their LSCA III grant. This latter weakness has compromised the State Library Agency's ability to deal effectively with the Legislature.

11: FUTURE DIRECTIONS FOR USOE

The State Librarian and State Library Commission believe that to effectively provide leadership and development of library service in North Dakota either all Federal funds for libraries must be channeled through one State agency or Federal legislation should be amended to require all Federal library funds to be placed in one Title of an Act (LSCA) and be administered by a Governor-designated State Agency. The State Librarian recommends the FULLER principle (Full Utilization of Library, Learning and Education Resources). The objectives of the plan, endorsed by the Advisory Council last year are:

- fuller use of existing library resources and services;
- establishment of statewide library borrowers' cards;
- elimination of jurisdictional limitations imposed by the source of funds and special interests;
- preservation of local autonomy as a political necessity and as a guard against centralized control by the State or Federal Government; and
- coordination by the State of all resource and service development to ensure an economical return on public funds.

Meeting these objectives would involve State reimbursement grants directly to libraries for extra-jurisdictional service costs, State inflation compensation grants indirectly to libraries through revenue sharing programs, and a State Agency responsible for the overall development and coordination of library service. In fact, on June 15, 1977 the State Librarian sent a wire to Congress stating that the State Library Commission's position in endorsing H.R. 3712 to extend LSCA on an interim basis was conditional on the White House Conference on Libraries and recommendations coming from that conference. The Commission prefers eventual consolidation of all titles of LSCA plus HEA Title II into one Federal grant to the States. The States would utilize funds according to State plans for coordinating and developing the resources of all types of libraries. LSCA or its amended equivalent funding mechanism must remain a State-based program. Statewide planning, equality of access to information, and coordination can only be done at the State level. LSCA changes needed are:

- a minimum State dollar expenditure for statewide public library service based upon population and on the ability to pay;

- a minimum level of public library service on a statewide basis and a required network providing equal access to State and national informational resources;
- a minimum size of local (or sub-State) library tax base, population, and expenditure of adequacy of local service and resources;
- a minimum level of State Administrative Agency support for management, consultation, planning, coordination, and supplementary library material resources; and
- the channeling of all Federal library funds through the LSCA for use within the State, with usage based upon a State Plan approved by the Governor and the U.S. Office of Education.

"To put large sums of Federal, State, or local money into our present North Dakota public library structure is of dubious value," reports the State Librarian in the Thirty-fifth Report of the Director State Library Commission to the Governor and to the Director of Institutions. The following changes should occur:

- Smaller library jurisdictions should be superseded by larger jurisdictions.
- Professional management must be implemented in lieu of lay administrative practices.
- State general funds must be appropriated.
- The public library must be seen as a vital and necessary governmental service.

One University librarian did say that the Federal Government is very biased in favor of public libraries. In these smaller States it is the academic libraries that show the real progress and leadership in the State while public libraries are "spinning wheels," and go nowhere.

It was also indicated by a number of librarians that NCLIS is being unrealistic in "trying to be all things to all people," and that such an approach will over-extend resources and cannot possibly be viable. NCLIS's National Plan is seen as concentrating on "sophisticated things and here we are trying to get bookmobile service to little towns which now only have Readers Digest." In other words, North Dakota's needs are uniquely different from those of a more urbanized State.

12: A DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF THE NORTH DAKOTA NETWORK FOR KNOWLEDGE

12.1: Services Offered by the North Dakota Network of Knowledge

The North Dakota Network for Knowledge provides for the coordination of the library service of all types of libraries on a community, regional, and statewide basis. The objective of the project is to ensure that all library resources within the State are interrelated and that all kinds of libraries are fully utilized to make it possible for North Dakota residents to have the opportunity to obtain needed services. It is the intent of the project to provide a collection with emphasis on specialized, infrequently used resources not readily available elsewhere in North Dakota. There is a proposal to move the Library now on the outskirts of town, onto the State Capitol grounds. If this materializes, the Capitol's legal and governmental collections will be accessible for use in the Network.

The North Dakota Network for Knowledge as a statewide communications system supporting an interlibrary loan and cooperation system supplements the resources available at local libraries. It offers, through its main hookup, a central catalog of library materials (print and audiovisual), consisting of the holdings of the 25 largest libraries in the State. There also is a common list of periodicals held in 46 libraries. This teletype (16 academic and public libraries in FY 76), mail, and WATS communications network facilitates the interlibrary loan based exchange of materials. If materials are unavailable in North Dakota, the State requests them through MINITEX. The State Library Agency also has the National Union Catalogue to locate and retrieve materials out-of-State, as well as other informal services. Membership is free, and all libraries within the State are eligible. Contacting non-member libraries was difficult because reliance depended on recollections of State Library staff and records of interlibrary loan transactions to show which libraries hadn't participated in the service rather than on enrollment records. Theoretically, all are eligible to receive services, including privately supported libraries, though private libraries are not eligible to receive LSCA III funds. Participation is very high in all categories of libraries except schools. Statistics based upon usage have shown little change over the years because most libraries entered the program immediately, indicating a high degree of public and academic support. Interestingly, the State Librarian, when questioned about variations in membership statistics over the years, stated that the statistics provided in the annual reports might not be accurate; the one's provided during the interview were.

Individuals without local libraries may contact the State Library directly to borrow materials, although this practice is mildly discouraged. Even those patrons with local libraries may go directly to State Library if they believe that their local facility is unable to provide desired materials.

12.2: Funding Sources

The North Dakota Network for Knowledge received $41,414 in LSCA III funds in Fiscal Year 1976, and $14,514 in State funds. The project received no local support.

12.3: Interaction with the State Library Agency

The project is operated by the State Library Agency and interaction in the conventional sense does not occur.

12.4: Staffing

The following State Library Agency personnel are involved in the project for the following percentages of time: State Librarian--28 percent to the new project; Director of Library Services--40 percent; and librarian--50 percent. Five library technicians are also assigned to the project. Most member libraries have one or more technicians and elect to operate the teletype with supervision and verification support from the reference staff or Library Director, depending on the library's size.

12.5: Role of the Project Advisory Council

No project advisory council exists. The Fiscal Year 1974 Annual Report discussed the possibility of adding a Project Director to the State Library staff for the purpose of gathering and interpreting data and recommending courses of action for the Network. An advisory committee to the Project Director also was to be established to provide input. Neither of these alternatives has been implemented.

12.6: Problems

One major problem seems to be the lack of communication between the State Library Agency and member libraries and to a lesser extent the lack of formal planning for future developments in networking. Member libraries were uncertain about or disagreed with what courses of action the State Library Agency plans for cooperative and networking activities. Also, it should be remembered site visits were conducted at the larger facilities with highly articulate, trained librarians and that a high percentage of libraries in the State are quite small, often open for a few hours a day. At the State Library Agency it was learned that one older librarian at such a small facility refused to allow to have a telephone installed and would not allow her personal telephone number to be included in the State Library Agency Directory because she did not want to be bothered.

The university libraries admitted that although they support a stronger network, they work independently in most instances. Also the State Library Agency is oriented toward public library needs. Several librarians, public as well as academic, felt that the State Library Agency underestimated the qualifications of public librarians. The State Plan does document the low educational attainments of librarians in the past (though this is changing) and the need to upgrade qualifications. The complaint heard particularly at the larger libraries was that continuing education workshops concentrate on paraprofessional features and do not address the shortcoming discussed in the State Plan.

Another problem that drew complaints from librarians is that interlibrary loan requests made by teletype unaccountably go astray or are often not answered. Also inconvenient is that the requesting library never knows the disposition of the requests as they are being forwarded by the State Library Agency. Finally, libraries tend to use inadequately trained teletype operators--often part-time or student help without reference training or knowledgeable attitudes about reference. This causes confusion as interlibrary loan requests or reference questions may be misinterpreted or slowed down significantly during the process.

12.7: Evaluation by the LSCA III Project

The North Dakota Network for Knowledge is an integral part of the State Library Agency. Therefore evaluations at a project level per se are not possible.

12.8: Impact

Every librarian is enthusiastic about the Network for Knowledge. There are individual complaints about areas to improve or change, but everyone agrees that an intrastate network such as this is essential.

12.9: Role of the Project in the State's Cooperative and Networking Efforts

The Network for Knowledge is the predominant activity in the State's cooperative/networking efforts. Even academic libraries, such as Grand Forks University of North Dakota, which has its own consortium, recognize and firmly believe in the idea of networking. Mention should be made of certain libraries' activities aside from the Network. A contract between the Grand Forks School District and Grand Forks Library Boards resulted in the School District renting a large space in the library to perform the service of processing and cataloging for themselves and the Grand Forks Public Library. The Library pays a fee, and in turn much of the credit for this goes to the Library Director who also co-authored the report done on State Interlibrary Cooperation in 1967. The University of North Dakota at Grand Forks is developing a unique computerized levels evaluation system to expedite ordering.

12.10: Project Relationships With Other Library Cooperative or Network Projects

The North Dakota Network for Knowledge belongs to MINITEX. An academic librarian proposed this in lieu of forming a consortium of academic libraries which might then join MINITEX. It was thought by joining MINITEX, the Network would be able to develop and thereby benefit all library users. In a related area, public librarians now watch MIDLNET development carefully to assess its relationship to them as members of MINITEX.

INTERLIBRARY COOPERATION AND NETWORKING: A CASE STUDY OF LSCA III AT THE STATE AND PROJECT LEVEL

State Visited: Rhode Island

LSCA III Project Visited: Statewide Processing Center

Period Studied: Fiscal Year 1976

1: INTRODUCTION

Library cooperation and networking are considered vital to Rhode Island because they assist in providing a wide variety of information and resources to the State's many small libraries which are often characterized by their one-room collections. Of the approximately 500 libraries in the State, over 80 percent are school libraries. In 1976 there were 44 public, 14 academic, and 34 special libraries. The State is divided into five multi-type interrelated regional systems. In 1976 it was estimated that the combined State, State-administered Federal funding, and derived income used to support library cooperation functions in Rhode Island totaled $682,485. A major share of this total was utilized to support the Rhode Island Interrelated Library Network (also known as the Statewide Library Network) which is operated by the State Library Agency. Federal funds in the form of LSCA I and LSCA III have played a critical role in this State, particularly in terms of upgrading basic library services. LSCA III has been used to support established programs rather than to develop new or innovative projects.

Rhode Island has traditionally been a fiscally conservative State with heavy emphasis on local autonomy. Yet, State legislation enacted at approximately the same time as the corrresponding Federal library legislation specifically authorizes inter-type library cooperation as well as funds for such activities. Unlike many other States, the State Library Agency is an autonomous unit within the State (the Department of State Library Services).

In this case study, the role and impact of LSCA III at the State and project level is examined. The Statewide Processing Center, a centralized acquisition, processing, and cataloging facility, which received LSCA III funds over a sustained period of time, has also been studied. This project was closed by the State government halfway through the funding period Fiscal Year 1976, and this fact provides important insights into LSCA III at the project level.

2: MANAGEMENT OF LSCA III AT THE STATE LEVEL

2.1: Needs Assessment

The Rhode Island State Library Agency has not conducted any needs assessments which would impact its LSCA III activities. Among the reasons given for this is the fact that the State Library Agency is understaffed and does not have the fiscal resources to support such activities. Other reasons for not conducting needs assessments include the small size of the State and the State's commitment, at least in the past, to a narrowly-defined program of library development. It is interesting to note that a number of librarians desired to have greater input into this activity so that policy and funding decisions affecting them would reflect their concerns and needs.

2.2: Defining LSCA III Objectives and Priorities

Rhode Island views its library development objectives to be in perfect agreement with the legislatively-defined objectives of LSCA III, and this emphasis is reinforced by legislation at the State level. Relative to the way LSCA I funds are used and the State's Five-Year Plan, Rhode Island views LSCA III as a means of supporting the Statewide Library Network which is an integral and ongoing component of the plan.

Given this setting, the State Library Agency defines its immediate objectives and priorities using its long-range plans and LSCA III program regulations. These objectives are seldom changed, although there have been changes in the means used to achieve them. In fact, the State Librarian noted that because both the Federal and State objectives of inter-type library cooperation are so broad, it is possible to make numerous operational changes without affecting the congruence between these objectives.

2.3: Policymaking at the State Level Relative to LSCA III

LSCA III related policy is developed by the State Library Agency. This process also involves the planning staff of the State Library Agency, personnel of libraries in the State, and the USOE Regional

Program Officer. The RPO reviews and comments on decisions. The LSCA Advisory Council functions in a similar review capacity. Librarians provide input through open meetings held throughout the year. Clearly, however, the most central and dominant source of real policy is the State Librarian and the Agency's planning staff. Most policymaking occurs on an annual basis and operates in a review and modification capacity.

2.4: The Role of the LSCA Advisory Council and State Library Agency Personnel in LSCA III

The LSCA Advisory Council or State Advisory Council on Libraries (SACOL), as it is known in Rhode Island, has 25 members representing public, academic, and special librarians; community agencies; citizens groups; public and private schools; and students. In addition, there is a mandated Advisory Board of Library Commissioners having seven members appointed by the Governor's office and the Legislature. The SACOL has a somewhat limited range of authority when contrasted with the Advisory Board of Library Commissioners, and its role is limited primarily to review of plans and programs. The Advisory Board, on the other hand, has the authority to review State Library Agency policy and also to act as a board of appeal in instances when local libraries appeal decisions by the State Library Agency on library services, standards, and certification. The extent to which the Commissioners are involved in LSCA III policy and programs again appears to be advisory in nature; the major policymaking is done by the State Library Agency.

State Library Agency personnel are heavily involved in LSCA III due primarily to the small size of the staff and the fact that Rhode Island has tended to use LSCA III funds to support cooperative projects used in the Agency itself. There is no position comparable to an LSCA III Coordinator and functions of this nature are generally assumed by the State Librarian or the Director of Technical Services.

2.5: Allocation of LSCA III Funds

The LSCA III funds received by Rhode Island are placed in a general account and mingled with other funds. LSCA III funds placed in a planning center are looked upon as a means of supporting staff and administration. Because the State Library Agency is committed to support long-range State level cooperative projects, such as the now defunct State Processing Center and the Statewide Library Network, more traditional funding mechanisms such as grants-in-aid, contracts, and inservice contracts are not employed.

2.6: Budget Preparation and Controls

In Rhode Island, the State Library Agency is responsible for preparing and approving LSCA III project budgets. The State Budget Office and Governor's Office have review and oversight authority but seldom modify the State Library Agency's requests. It is very evident that the State does control the budgets and exercise its authority to review and modify library programs. The fact that the Statewide Processing Center, which represents a main thrust of LSCA III in Rhode Island, was closed down by the State because of fiscal problems, bears witness to this power.

2.7: Evaluation by the State Library Agency

Evaluation of LSCA III projects by the State Library Agency is for the most part informal. The method used is informal feedback from participating libraries. Also, the State Library Agency reviews the various reports submitted by the projects as a means of evaluating projects. Judging from the abrupt close-down of the Statewide Processing Center, it would appear that the State Library Agency may not have evaluated its LSCA III projects with sufficient vigor. However, it is also evident that the State Library Agency may not have adequate resources, particularly funds, to support more formal evaluation of its projects.

3: IMPACT AND USE OF FEDERAL AND STATE REQUIREMENTS AND CONTROLS ON LSCA III ACTIVITIES

3.1: LSCA III Requirements/Controls

The State Library Agency views the various Federal requirements as generally useful in the planning and management of LSCA III.

Thus, the Five-Year State Program, Basic State Plan, Annual Plan, and Project Reports are viewed favorably and used particularly when dealing with the Governor's Office. The State Librarian was somewhat less enthusiastic about the Advisory Council and emphases on needs assessment and evaluation. As is noted elsewhere, Rhode Island and the State Library Agency are relatively small, and this appears to result in a view that it is relatively easy to monitor the needs of patrons and to be able to make policy decisions based on informal consensus.

3.2: State Controls/Requirements

LSCA III represents a comparatively small source of Federal funding for Rhode Island; and as a result, the State has not taken an active role in supporting LSCA III projects or program goals. However, the State Legislature has passed legislation authorizing inter-type library cooperation, and has funded such activities. These legislative initiatives do not appear to have been the result of the influence of LSCA III.

The State Budget Office has impacted the conduct of LSCA III projects, particularly in the use of the Statewide Processing Center. Much of the reporting to the State is informal; and when written reports are required, they tend to be brief.

4: USE OF LSCA III FUNDS BY THE STATE LIBRARY AGENCY

4.1: Types and Number of LSCA III Projects Funded

The following table presents a summary of LSCA III projects funded in Rhode Island between 1969-76. As can be seen from this table, the vast majority of LSCA III dollars received by the State have been channeled into activities at the State Library Agency. Specifically, the State has invested heavily in the development of the Statewide Library Network and the Statewide Processing Center. As a rule, the State has matched LSCA III funds. LSCA III funds have been used to support staff and existing programs and not innovative, new programs.

During Fiscal Year 1976, all LSCA III funds were used to support the Statewide Processing Center which was closed by the State six

LSCA III PROJECTS FOR THE STATE OF RHODE ISLAND

YEAR	TITLE OF PROJECT	ADMINISTERING AGENCY	Source of Funds				Use		
			LSCA III	STATE	LOCAL	OTHER	SALARIES	EQUIPMENT	OTHER
1969	1. Unified System of Library Services/Statewide Library Network	Rhode Island Department of State Library Services	$40,761	$64,699			$ 95,930		$ 9,530
1970	1. Expansion of Statewide Library Network	Rhode Island Department of State Library Services	40,761	78,772			109,222	$ 40	10,271
1971	1. Expansion of Statewide Library Network	Rhode Island Department of State Library Services	40,761	81,578			24,151	4,025	94,163
1972	1. Expansion of Statewide Library Network	Rhode Island Department of State Library Services	42,398	87,245		Title I[1]	113,484	5,050	11,109
1973	1. Statewide Processing Center	Rhode Island Department of State Library Services	38,284	44,568			79,654		3,058
	2. Statewide Library Network	Rhode Island Department of State Library Services	4,483	70,000		Title I[1]	74,483		
1974	1. Statewide Processing Center	Rhode Island Department of State Library Services	42,171	55,510			95,902		1,779
	2. Materials Acquisition/Information Retrieval/Catalog System Improvement	Rhode Island Department of State Library Services	9,120[2]					5,000	4,120
	3. Incentive Grant	Rhode Island Department of State Library Services	266[2]				266		
1975	1. New England Library Compact	New England Board	10,000[2]						10,000 (contractual)
	2. Material Acquisition/Catalog System Improvement	Rhode Island Department of State Library Services	2,855[2]						2,855 (contractual)
	3. Statewide Processing Center	Rhode Island Department of State Library Services	42,154	52,186			91,956		2,384
1976	1. Statewide Processing Center	Rhode Island Department of State Library Services	42,154	59,780			97,559		4,375

[1] Amount and use not available

[2] Carryover from FY 73.

months into the Fiscal Year. The remaining or unexpended funds were used to offset staff costs during the transition period following closing of the center.

4.2: Products and Services Resulting from Availability of LSCA III Funds

The State Librarian was reluctant to attribute any products to LSCA III directly, prefering to note that LSCA III has fostered a climate which makes cooperative ventures more viable. However, the State has been able to install a number of TWX terminals (21) in libraries, and as noted elsewhere is a member of the New England Library Board (NELB). LSCA III did provide substantial support for the acquisition and distribution activities of the Processing Center, but these activities have since reverted back to the local libraries.

4.3: Adequacy and Ratios of Funding

Funding from the Federal and State level is assessed as very inadequate and is the reason for failure of the Processing Center.

4.4: Use of LSCA III Funds to Join Existing Cooperatives and Networks

The State Librarian was opposed to the use of LSCA III to join other cooperatives or networks. The reason for this is that if such an activity was required, the State might be forced into a situation of joining a network which does not adequately meet the State's needs. This attitude is confirmed by observing the pattern of use of LSCA III funds; LSCA III funds were used only once to support membership in NELB.

4.5: Other Funds Used for Interlibrary Cooperation

As pointed out earlier, the Rhode Island legislature has provided slight informal overmatching of LSCA III. This represents the primary non-LSCA III source of support for the interlibrary cooperation.

4.6: Restricted or Discontinued LSCA III Projects

The Statewide Processing Center was discontinued in 1975 because of fiscal management problems. No other projects initiated with

LSCA III funds have been discontinued. It is evident that the limited amount of LSCA III funds has restricted the State's ability to expand the Statewide Library Network. However, this may be due to the absence of a higher level of State support and not the limited amount of LSCA III funds available to the State.

5: STATE MEMBERSHIP IN INTERSTATE COMPACTS AND MULTI-STATE NETWORKS

Rhode Island is involved in a number of interstate compacts and multi-state networks. Due in part to its New England location, Rhode Island is a member of the New England Library Board (NELB) which is currently operated by personnel in Connecticut. NELB is organized to link the six New England States together for information exchange and coordination for the purpose of improving library services. Its membership is made up of each of the member's State Librarians. As a result of this membership, Rhode Island has available to it the following cooperative services:

- New England Document Conservation Center, which advises on and does repairs and other conservation services on a contractual basis.
- New England Library Resource Network including the New England Serials Service (NESS), which locates scarce serial items for interlibrary loan networks.

The State is also a member of the New England Interstate Library Compact which provides a mechanism for sharing service on a cooperative basis. Also, Rhode Island is a member of the New England Library Information Network (NELINET) an outgrowth of NELB, and acts as a computerized inter-type library network having access to the Ohio College Library Center (OCLC).

6: INTERACTION BETWEEN THE STATE LIBRARY AGENCY AND LSCA III PROJECTS

Because Rhode Island has traditionally utilized LSCA III to augment other funds, it has not funded projects operated by agencies other than the State Library Agency. As such, there is no interaction between what would be termed the grantee and the funding agency.

7: STATE AND PROJECT LEVEL ASSESSMENT OF THE LSCA III PROGRAM MANAGEMENT AT THE FEDERAL LEVEL

7.1: Technical Assistance

Technical assistance provided by the Regional Program Officer to the State and its projects is rated as excellent by the State Librarian. However, this assistance appears to be limited to more routine reporting and not to key technical and procedural issues associated with the actual conduct of LSCA III activities.

7.2: Project Monitoring

Monitoring of LSCA III projects by the Regional Program Officer has not been extensive, however, the quality of that assistance was highly rated by the State Librarian. There was some concern about the fact that review of reports tended to be more concerned with details and not overriding issues.

7.3: Dissemination of Information and Materials

Dissemination activity by Federal officials was also highly rated although there is no indication as to how such activity has impacted Rhode Island.

8: THE FEDERAL FUNDING FORMULA

8.1: Matching Versus Nonmatching of State and Federal Funds

The State Librarian was emphatically in favor of imposing a requirement that States match LSCA III funds. The reason for this is that Rhode Island has consistently matched and overmatched LSCA III with its own funds (although this is not required by USOE, and the State Librarian feels that this is exemplary behavior.

In addition to favoring matching of State funds, the State Librarian would favor requiring an overmatching provision[1/] as well as a four-fold increase in the basic amount of the Federal grant because it would provide increased support for libraries. However, the issue of whether the State Legislation would continue to provide matching State funds in the event of an increase was not addressed.

[1/] The State Librarian did not specify what this envisioned Federal/State formula would be.

8.2: Impact of Increased Federal LSCA III Funds

If appropriations for LSCA III were increased, Rhode Island would immediately expand the scope of its current cooperative efforts. The operating level of the Statewide Library Network would be raised. The State would promote centralized processing but would not attempt to restart the Processing Center. Also, cooperative activities would be broadened to include school libraries. Finally, a major effort would be made to make better use of new technology such as on-line cataloging and automated circulation. Presumably, such cooperative activities would be expected to enhance the ability of Rhode Island libraries to meet patron needs.

9: IMPACT OF LSCA III IN RHODE ISLAND

9.1: Development of LSCA III Projects Without Federal Funds

The infusion of LSCA III funds enabled Rhode Island to accelerate the development of cooperative projects, but these same funds are not the sole motivation behind this move toward cooperation between libraries. Specifically, LSCA III as applied in Rhode Island appears to have enabled the State to engage in cooperative activity to a greater degree than would have been possible without those funds.

9.2: Achievement of LSCA III Projects

There does not seem to be a clear distinction between LSCA I and LSCA III in this regard except to the extent that LSCA III was used extensively to support the Statewide Library Network. Clearly, the Statewide Processing Center, which also received much of its support from LSCA III, did not succeed and may not have had an impact because of the limited numbers of libraries that subscribed to its services. Achievements of LSCA III projects in Rhode Island are best examined in terms of the ability to improve receptiveness toward cooperation as well as the State legislature's support of LSCA III efforts.

9.3: Predictability of Funding and Its Impact on Cooperatives

Delays in appropriation of LSCA III funds does affect the State Library Agency's ability to plan ahead. One factor cited as a cause underlying the failure of the Statewide Processing Center was the fact that funds could only be counted on for one year periods.

10: STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES OF THE LSCA III PROGRAM

The State Librarian viewed LSCA III's strengths in terms of its existence as a piece of Federal legislation. Its second strength is that it can supplement LSCA I supported cooperative projects. This outlook is probably best explained by Rhode Island combining funds from all sources into one account and the State then distributing funds from this general account to support library projects at the local and State level.

LSCA III weaknesses as a funding source are that it is meager and that LSCA III funds cannot be used to purchase materials which might facilitate cooperative efforts. However the direction that these purchases would take as selected acquisitions is potentially problematic because the linkage of such actions to cooperative efforts is debatable.

11: FUTURE DIRECTIONS FOR USOE

The major shift sought for the future is that the level of Federal support for LSCA III be increased. This sentiment was voiced by the State Librarian as well as a number of other librarians in the State. Also, the State Librarian felt that a Federal Library (not necessarily the Library of Congress) should be responsible for establishing a national network. Also any programs resulting from the NCLIS National Program should be totally supported by Federal sources.

Librarians in Rhode Island provided a variety of information about future directions. There was uniform support for the development of national networking initiatives. Specific recommendations included the need for a national lending library, and that funds committed to the Library of Congress (which would serve as this lending library) could, in part, be passed on to local libraries. The assumption underlying this idea is that if materials were circulated by the Library of Congress, needless duplication of collections and collection building would be reduced. Also, the Library of Congress should be responsible for coordinating the many existing networks, and such an approach should go beyond cataloging and include acquisitions. Currently there is a feeling of being "netted to death."

A second possible course would require that the Federal government implement the results of the White House Conference on Library and Information Sciences to be held in 1979 through a program of legislation and funding.

A number of librarians voiced the need for closer scrutiny by LSCA III Program officials and specifically that LSCA III projects receive closer scrutiny. In a related area, the need for increased access to and participation in decisionmaking relating to LSCA III at the State level was raised by one librarian. Echoing this, a second librarian stressed the need to provide for more extensive planning at the State level.

Another concern revolved around the inadequacies of networking and the need for a further, perhaps, more definitive study. Examples cited to support this notion include instances of faulty cataloging by OCLC, the inability of large networks to adapt to specialized cataloging designs (e.g., special libraries), and the impact of networks in reducing the work force at the local library level.

12: A DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF AN LSCA III PROJECT

The LSCA III project described in this section was closed by the State halfway through the Fiscal Year selected for study. The project, known as the Statewide Processing Center, had operated since 1968 as part of the State Library Agency, and as noted in detail below, was the primary recipient of LSCA III funds in Rhode Island during that period. The project is described below.

12.1: Services Offered by the Statewide Processing Center

The Statewide Processing Center (SWPC), began operations in 1968 and was intended to act as the central facility for acquisitions, cataloging and processing of all items requested by all types of libraries in the State. Central processing was intended to provide quality control of cataloging in the State and to produce a union catalog of these processed items. Specific services offered by SWPC included:

- Ordering of any book item and non-book items (records, filmstrips, cassettes, etc.). Selection was not done by the State Library Agency; each individual library made its own selections. Foreign language items and serial publications were not ordered. Other items not ordered included out-of-print books and government documents.
- Cataloging of all ordered materials, as well as the cataloging/recataloging of any item sent from an existing collection. The Dewey Decimal Classification scheme and Library of Congress subject headings were used. Sets of catalog cards were produced for each item so handled.
- Processing of all items cataloged to include preparation of book cards and pockets, jackets, and labels.
- Biweekly delivery of materials to the requesting library.

The SWPC would receive requests for materials, review its holdings, and batch process requests using a State operated multi-agency computer facility. During its last year of operation, the project, using its linkage to NELINET, expanded its cataloging services to the participating libraries.

12.2: Funding Sources

During Fiscal Year 1976, the Statewide Processing Center was supported with funds from four sources. First, approximately $42,000 of the State's LSCA III grant was allocated to the project. A State grant of about $59,000 essentially matched the LSCA III funds. Third, each member library was required to pay a subscription/processing fee of one dollar for each requested item. Finally, each library receiving centralized cataloging services was required to pay a $200 annual fee.

12.3: Interaction With the State Library Agency

The project was operated and managed by the State Library Agency, and formal interaction in the form of reports and meetings to the monitoring agency did not take place.

12.4: Staffing

The SWPC was staffed by four full-time technical personnel responsible for processing of purchases and cataloging, one full-time clerk, and two part-time students. Staffing was viewed as a problem during Fiscal Year 1976 which could have been resolved through the addition of more personnel.

12.5: Role of the Project Advisory Council

The project had no Advisory Council per se, but project staff and the State Librarian did meet with representatives of member libraries on a regular basis.

12.6: Problems

Clearly, the Statewide Processing Center had problems, a number of which were sufficient to cause the State Budget Office to require the center to close halfway through its funding period (December 1975). These problems included a lack of planning during the design of this centralized processing center, and inability to provide the desired services with greater cost-effectiveness than decentralized processing. In fact, during the last two years of operation a $27,000 deficit was encountered. This deficit was attributed to an inadequate volume of work as a provider of needed revenues. Delays were often encountered in the use of the State computer facility because library related work received low priority. Another problem affecting the Center's ability to process documents was the waiting period between the time a request was made by the Center and the response from the supplier. This problem was not within the control of the Center, however. Another complication involved the length of time needed to catalog a difficult item. For example, it would take longer to catalog a filmstrip than a written treatise on the same subject.

Other problems included low productivity among the SWPC staff which the State Librarian attributed to the type of work done by the Center. Also, the project failed in its attempt to obtain subsidization by the State Education Agency despite the servicing of school libraries.

12.7: Evaluation by the LSCA III Project

Evaluation of the project was quite limited and consisted primarily of reviewing reports and meeting with member librarians. It is evident that the librarians were dissatisfied with the SWPC, and that those persons responsible for the Center may not have been sensitive to these complaints.

12.8: Impact

The project's impact on libraries in Rhode Island is interesting. While in operation, only about 40 percent of the State's 500 libraries used the services of the SWPC; and as noted below, satisfaction among these users with the services of the project was low. During its 10 year history, the Center processed an average of 35,000 print and non-print materials each year. On the other hand, however, the State Librarian did point out that since the Center closed, school and small public libraries now face sizable processing and cataloging backlogs primarily because they lack adequate staff.

Reasons why the project had such a limited impact are summarized below:

- The Director did not adequately survey the field libraries to determine what minimum income and processing demand would support the Center.
- Most libraries had their own cataloging staffs and established cataloging practices, and did not want to send items to the SWPC because the Center was not able to customize its cataloging.
- The SWPC did not handle all types of materials. Because it did not handle foreign publications, academic and research libraries (a large, high volume segment) did not use the Processing Center's services.

- The SWPC staff was small in relation to the actual amount of cataloging and the time required to do accurate cataloging.
- The SWPC batch processed materials causing low productivity.
- The libraries using the service were dissatisfied with the turnaround time. Often having to wait months for an item to return, these dissatisfied libraries withdrew from participating in the Processing Center, causing a large revenue-loss.
- The focus of the Project was too broad. It tried to meet all cataloging/processing needs for all libraries, when it lacked a refined, efficient, automated cataloging operation and enough trained staff.
- The Processing Center did not have enough publicity. Some libraries that the Processing Center could have served adequately did not know about it.

12.9: Role of the Project In the State's Cooperative and Networking Efforts

The Statewide Processing Center was intended to complement the Statewide Library Network which provides reference and referral, delivery, interlibrary loan and telecommunications services for all but two of the libraries in Rhode Island. Most librarians regarded the SWPC as a minor component of the State's efforts to provide a centralized cooperative. The fact that no efforts have been taken to re-establish a processing center would indicate the librarians' perceptions on this issue to be accurate.

12.10: Project Relationships with Other Library Cooperatives and Networks

The SWPC was affiliated with NELINET (New England Library Information Network) which provided cataloging services via OCLC. It appears that this relationship was one way in which NELINET provided services but did not utilize SWPC to support its programs.

INTERLIBRARY COOPERATION AND NETWORKING: A CASE STUDY OF LSCA III AT THE STATE AND PROJECT LEVEL

State Visited: Texas

LSCA III Project Visited:

(1) Inter-University Council of North Texas Microform Catalog Project

(2) Statewide Publicity Program for Texas Major Resource Systems

(3) Membership in the South West Library Association--Continuing Education for Library Staff Project

Period Studied: Fiscal Year 1976

1: INTRODUCTION

The distribution of library resources is very uneven in Texas. Twenty-one counties have no public library service at all, and six counties do not have publicly supported library service. The reason for the latter is that some of the libraries are lending libraries run by volunteer women's auxiliaries. In other areas, the library is located in a non-incorporated area, and therefore has no tax base for library service. In contrast to this, Texas has 14 library and information centers with 500,000 or more volumes located within a 50-mile radius of one another. In 1973 this area was ranked eighth among the States in terms of total volumes (30.7 million) in research libraries. Because of this unevenness of libraries and library service, the State Library Agency has been particularly concerned about cooperative endeavors. As far back as 1962, the Library Development Committee of the Texas Library Association was asked to design a plan for upgrading individual libraries and, at the same time, for providing a method of cooperation among libraries. The committee acted promptly, submitting a Skeletal Plan for Statewide Library Development in 1963. This plan recommended that Texas adopt a cooperative pattern of library service with participation by all types of libraries--academic, private, public, and school.

An active campaign to publicize the value of the proposed plan was carried out over a period of several years. State aid to formally organized library systems gained favor as a more certain and productive way to achieve the goals of library development. Federal programs in these years helped to stimulate joint efforts among libraries. The First Texas Governor's Conference on Libraries was held in 1966, and 2,000 persons--lay and professional--considered and enthusiastically adopted the systems concept. A few months later ten geographical service districts were designated by the State Library Agency following a meeting with the Texas Library Association's Library Development Committee. Initially the districts were utilized for providing State services to public libraries. Later they were to define the geographical boundaries of cooperative systems.

The drafting of a library systems bill was undertaken by the Texas Library Association's Legislative Committee and presented to the organization at its 1968 annual meeting. In 1969 the bill (known as the Systems Act) was adopted by the Texas Legislature and approved by the Governor. However, since the Skeletal Plan of 1963, the proposed legislation has been changed to include only public libraries. All other libraries were excluded from receiving services funded under this act. This was the first major setback to the development of cooperative and networking centers in Texas.

A second setback was the lack of full funding for the Systems Act prior to 1975. However, in Fiscal Year 1975 the State Library Agency decided to dedicate $1.8 million in Federal funds for that purpose. Soon thereafter the Texas Legislature made its first substantial appropriations, amounting to $1 million in Fiscal Year 1977. Thus, responsibility for action was passed to the public libraries to demonstrate their ability to work collectively under the new law and to achieve a higher level of library service for their patrons.

Due to the very limited funding of $50,000 a year for each of three years beginning in Fiscal Year 1972, only token attempts at cooperative activity were made. One exception was the interlibrary loan program, which established electronic communication among the larger libraries including many academic libraries, and developed a register of monographs in their holdings. The program has developed into a valuable cooperative service, despite financial limitations. In fact, because of the perceived value of the interlibrary loan program, public libraries joined the library systems in increasing numbers, rising from 165 in 1971 to 247 in 1975. Ninety percent of the population of Texas is now served by system members. In this profile of LSCA III in Texas, the State's activities and the series of projects receiving LSCA III funds in Fiscal Year 1976 are examined. This approach may seem to differ from the more standard approach used for this study--concentration on one LSCA III Project--however, Texas treats the three projects described here as one program. Thus, participation in the Southwest Library Association (SWLA) CELS program, the Inter University Council of North Texas Microform Catalog project, and the Statewide Publicity Program for Texas Major Resource Systems constitute one LSCA III Project.

2: MANAGEMENT OF LSCA III AT THE STATE LEVEL

2.1: Needs Assessment

The State Library Agency has conducted a needs assessment for the State of Texas and concluded that great inequities exist in public library service throughout the State. This condition results from the unequal population distribution and variations in the taxable wealth of local communities, primarily the property tax. Perhaps an equally serious problem is the unsuccessful political posture of Texas public libraries in their competition for public dollars to meet public information needs. The State has not reached the point of viewing library service in terms of information and referral services, special services to special groups, and automation. Many legislators view the role of the library as one which has been unchanged since the 1930s. Because the State sees services of the library as unchanging, funding has been difficult to obtain. Of $2,579,700,000 in direct local government expenditures for 1967, only $11,529,480, or four-tenths of one percent, was spent for public library service. By 1973 this amount had more than doubled to $26,206,931, but it is not clear that this reprsents an increasing share of governmental expenditures. Also prior to 1970, the State's contribution to public library services had been non-existent. The reason for this is that there was no statute providing for such contributions until the Library Systems Act in 1969.

2.2: Defining LSCA III Objectives and Priorities

Under the LSCA Long-Range Plan for Texas, a primary goal is to strengthen the concept of a statewide system of library services. Further, within the Texas State Library and Historical Commission's Budget Request for Fiscal Years 1976 and 1977, the program budget for Network Development further states the goal: "to provide access to information and informational materials for Texas citizens through the cooperative use of information resources in Texas libraries (public, academic, and special) regardless of the governmental subdivision in which the library or institution is located."

These long range goals have been translated into the following LSCA III project objectives to:

- provide startup funds for interstate, statewide, regional, and local networks of library and information resources, consisting of two or more types of libraries;
- coordinate all network development with national and regional networking in order to provide a state-based network, including Texas libraries, that is compatible technically and operationally with future networks;
- demonstrate in a regional and/or statewide library and information network, services, hardware, access procedures, or bibliographic tools that will make available the total information and informational resources of Texas libraries to the primary user agencies;
- conduct demonstrations of interlibrary cooperation in accordance with standards set by the appropriate Federal agencies or national associations;
- produce and/or provide access to union lists, cumulative indices, directories, and other bibliographic tools to facilitate rapid identification, access and referral;
- coordinate and assist in developing computer support for individual or cooperative library processing and/or informational retrieval;
- demonstrate low-cost communication systems between and among Texas libraries and information centers;
- support or conduct research, development, and evaluation in areas of statewide or interstate concern, and to disseminate information relating to those areas of concern; and

- provide information to the public about cooperative networks of libraries, allowing for the systematic and effective coordination of the resources of the school, public, academic, and special libraries the information centers for improved supplementary services for the special clientele served by each type of library or center.

The objectives were determined with the overriding goal of developing the statewide system of library services capable of interfacing with the proposed national network. The Library staff does admit that since these objectives were drawn up, they have had to take a more realistic view of their goals and objectives in view of the limited funding that is available.

2.3: Policymaking at the State Level Relative to LSCA III

LSCA III policymaking is centralized and involves the following groups and persons in the following ways:

- LSCA III Advisory Council--assessing needs and setting priorities;
- State Librarian--setting priorities;
- LSCA III Program Coordinator Team--setting priorities and objectives, and determining criteria for allocating LSCA III resources; and
- State Library Planning Staff--assessing needs, setting priorities and setting objectives.

Librarians in the field appear to accept this process; no complaints have been received.

The following policymaking processes are engaged informally once a year as required in the Annual Plan, although there is continuous informal policymaking: assessing needs, setting priorities and objectives, reviewing objectives, determining criteria for allocating LSCA III resources, and allocating LSCA III resources.

2.4: The Role of the Advisory Council and State Library Agency Personnel in LSCA III

The role of the LSCA Advisory Council is viewed as having questionable significance because of the limited amount of technical assistance they are able to provide as well as the difficulty of gathering the Council together. The Council has the power to recommend policy, to advise on budget matters, to advise on the development of the State plan (which includes library programs other than those of an LSCA III nature), to assist in evaluating LSCA III programs, plans, and activities, and to review the budget.

The Manager of Management and Planning for the State Library Agency--one of the three persons filling the role of LSCA III Coordinator--believes that the Advisory Council is not the best and most productive source of input about LSCA III projects. Many of the LSCA III projects are experimental and technologically complex (in that they often involve automation, new processes or hardware that needs testing). Also, as stated earlier, the Advisory Council is commissioned to look at many library goals other than those involving LSCA III projects. As a result, the efforts of the Council become less effective because they tend to be spread too thin. The manager has mentioned the fact that while LSCA III once included specifications for a LSCA III Advisory Council whose sole duties were to evaluate and advise on library cooperation, it is not known why this has not been adhered to in Texas.

The time spent on LSCA III activities during each month by personnel is as follows: the State Librarian spends approximately three percent; the Assistant State Librarians spends approximately five percent; the Manager of Management and Planning spends approximately 10 percent; and the Director of Library Development spends approximately 15 percent. In addition, managers, reviewers, and planners are actively involved.

2.5: Allocation of LSCA III Funds

Allocating LSCA III funds received by Texas and allocation of State funds for LSCA III projects are based on the proposed project's relevance to the implementation of State goals and objectives. There is open competition for funding; and because funding is limited and unpredictable, only one-time demonstration projects are funded. Specifically, the LSCA III funds are used as startup or seed money.

One aspect of the application for funding requires the applicants to predict how they might seek other funds once the demonstration period is over. When the demonstration period is completed, it is the responsibility of the grantee to secure other funds if the project is to continue. The Library staff believes that this is the best system. All institutions are eligible to compete for LSCA III funds.

The process of reviewing proposals is the responsibility of the Assistant State Librarian/Coordinator for all Federal Programs, the Director of Library Development Division, the Manager of the Management and Planning Office, and the Head of Network Development.

When reviewing proposals for LSCA III funding, soundness of procedures or operational plans, and the degree to which the project addresses high priority needs have been found to be very useful criteria. Recently, the review committee found that assessing the relationship of the proposal to the long-range program for library development was a useless criterion, and as a result they have revised and updated the Five-Year Plan.

2.6: Budgetary Preparation and Control

Once LSCA III funds are allocated to the State, the review team begins the process of selecting grantees. The proposals are first reviewed by the staff development team who may make budget changes. The State Librarian then receives the plans and also has the power to alter the budget, but rarely exercises this power. The Library and Historical Commission (a six-member Board that governs the State Library Agency) reviews the budget in proforma fashion, then sends it to the Governor who, as the State Executive, has the final approval power.

The Manager of Management and Planning for the State Library Agency has expressed some concern about the involvement of the LSCA III Advisory Council in the budgetary process. "Because many of the LSCA III projects are experimental and technologically complex, the Council is often unable to fully understand the budget requirements."

It is often very difficult to get the Council together which means budget approval can be delayed. The Manager suggested that aside from the Advisory Council, outside persons with expertise in the areas in which proposals are being funded be included in the budget process.

2.7: Evaluation by the State Library Agency

Fairly extensive evaluations of LSCA III projects are undertaken by the State Library Agency, utilizing a variety of approaches as described below.

- Formal surveys of operations at member libraries. This is done at the initiative of the librarians themselves who keep the project staff continuously aware of their progress. This occurs via phone, written and oral reports, and professional meetings.
- Formal surveys of users of the service. Again, this is done at the initiative of the member librarians who communicate their opinions of the project on a continuous basis with the State Library Agency staff.
- Informal feedback from library personnel participating in project activities. This is continuous and is usually accomplished through telephone conversations and at association meetings. The State Library Agency staff members find this method of evaluation to be extremely effective. Library members tend to be honest and straightforward and provide useful information in this manner.
- Systems analysis and cost effectiveness studies. This is done periodically and is used as a method of evaluating grants and monitoring their progress.
- Analysis of cost and usage statistics. This technique is used two or three times during each fiscal year, as part of the review process for award of grants.
- Analysis of records of number of people having access to project services. This is a continuous process and is used as an evaluative method for LSCA III projects.
- Official meetings with members of the target population. This is usually done at Texas Library Association meetings because money for onsite visits is not available.

The State Agency conducts evaluations of LSCA III projects once every 12 months on a formal basis and once every six months on an informal basis. Also the Agency staff does maintain continuous contact with member libraries. The Agency rated all of their evaluative methods as moderately useful. There has been no final evaluation of the LSCA III projects because they are all currently in progress. The evaluation of LSCA III projects is the primary responsibility of the LSCA III project staff and the State Library Agency.

3: IMPACT AND USE OF FEDERAL AND STATE REQUIREMENTS AND CONTROLS ON LSCA III ACTIVITIES

3.1: LSCA Requirements/Controls

This section describes the use of each LSCA regulation by the Texas Library Agency.

The Five Year State Plan has been rated by the State Library Agency as being useless. Their reason is that other forms of planning processes are better suited and can be administered with some expertise at their agency. They particularly view the CIPP model as useless. Even though it was not forced on State Library Agencies, it has been strongly suggested that they use it. The Texas State Library's Planner and Program Analyst has stated that CIPP is complicated in comparison to other models. It is felt to be ambiguous and non-specific. There is contention that most State Libraries do not use CIPP even though they may give it lip service. This analyst doubts if five out of the 52 State Librarians actively make use of CIPP. The Texas State Library Agency uses zero-based budgeting for LSCA I and III.

The Annual Program is viewed as useful but it is suggested that guidelines for its preparation should be provided by HEW in advance of each Fiscal Year for which the Annual Program is to be prepared. The Basic State Plan is rated as useless by the State Library Agency because it does not carry LSCA III guidelines. The only guide contained in this Plan is that "there must be two or more types of libraries." According to the State Library Agency staff, more guidelines are needed in order for States to coordinate their programs nationally. Presently each State is totally autonomous and is able to benefit from another. Project reports are rated useful. They are especially helpful because the State does not have the time nor money for onsite visits to projects. The reports have become their only means of measuring the success or failure of a project.

3.2: State Requirements/Controls

The State Librarian reviews and approves the expenditures of the LSCA III projects every four months as well as prior to the award. At the end of the project the State Librarian reviews the project via audit. In addition, the State Auditor reviews the project's expenditure once every year.

4: USE OF LSCA III FUNDS BY THE STATE LIBRARY AGENCY

4.1: Types and Numbers of LSCA III Projects Funded

The following table presents available data on LSCA III projects in Texas from 1967 to 1976.

The Interlibrary Cooperation Project for Fiscal Year 1976 provided funding to three projects:

(1) Southwestern Library Association: Continuing Education for Library Staff in the Southwest.
(2) Inter-University Council of the North Texas Area: Microform Catalogues.
(3) Texas Library Association: A Statewide Publicity Program for Texas Major Resources Systems, 1976-77.

4.2: Products and Services Resulting from Availability of LSCA III Funds

LSCA III funds have been used extensively to support the Texas State Library Communications Network. Also, LSCA III has enabled the State to provide in excess of 5,200 workshop hours of continuing education for librarians. Finally, LSCA III funds have supported many of the State's efforts to improve and automate cataloging and bibliographic services.

LSCA III PROJECTS FOR THE STATE OF TEXAS

YEAR	TITLE OF PROJECT	ADMINISTERING AGENCY	Source of Funds				Use		
			LSCA III	STATE	LOCAL	OTHER	SALARIES	EQUIPMENT	OTHERS
1969	1. Texas State Library Communication Network (TSLCN)	Texas State Library Agency	$ 18,689	$1,289	$26,196		$ 29,417		$ 16,757
	2. Compilation and Publication of List of Newspaper Holdings	Texas Christian University	9,500		9,500		8,325		10,675
	3. Library Cooperative Network Study Demonstration	Southern Methodist University	11,000		11,749		3,622		19,127
1970	1. Extention of Regional Information Communication Network (RICE) Network and Expansion of TSLCN	Rice University/ Texas State Library Agency							
	2. Interlibrary loan Among Public libraries	Texas State Library Agency							
1971	1. Administration of LSCA III	Texas State Library Agency	8,517	1,526			10,043		
	2. Expansion of TSLCN	Texas State Library Agency	39,964	6,005	98,887		109,203		35,653
1972	1. Multi-State Continuing Education and Consulting Service	Texas State Library Agency	68,266						68,266
1973	1. Expansion of TSLCN	Texas State Library Agency	73,127						73,127
	2. Expansion of Computer Based Cataloging and Bibliography System TEXAS NUMERICAL REGISTER-(TNR)	Texas State Library Agency	104,767						104,767 (contractual)
	3. TSLCN and Texas Information Exchange (TIE)	Texas State Library Agency	8,727						8,727 (contractual)
1974	1. Expansion of TNR	Texas State Library Agency	7,575						7,575 (contractual)
	2. Special Purpose Projects.	Texas State Library Agency	145,555						145,555 (contractual)
1975									
1976	1. Demonstration of Interlibrary Cooperation, Coordination of State's Networks	Texas State Library Agency	66,343						66,343 (contractual)

4.3: Adequacy and Ratios of Funding Sources

The adequacy of Federal funding was viewed as insufficient. The feeling is that there was so much to do in the State vis-a-vis networking and cooperation, and there is not enough money to do it with.

Texas provides no LSCA III type funds for library cooperatives. It is also difficult to get local governments to fund library cooperatives. As a result, local funds are directed toward traditional library services such as building book collections, salaries, binding, etc. Therefore, Federal funds are used for library development and for library stimulation. With these funds new technologies and special programming can be tried. Most librarians have a difficult time convincing their local officials of the merits of these projects until they have proven themselves. Federal funding allows innovative services to be provided. Librarians hope that by the time the demonstration period is over, the patrons and local officials will be convinced of its merits. Where local funds are limited, Federal funding is viewed as the "life flow" of service. Also, startup programs are expensive. Most local governments do not have the resources to support these projects even if they see the importance of such participation. Such has been the contribution of LSCA III demonstration projects in Texas; they have provided funding for startup projects.

4.4: Use of LSCA III Funds to Join Existing Cooperatives and Networks

Two of the LSCA III projects have memberships in other networks. AMIGOS has membership in OCLC, and CELS has membership in CLENE and SLICE.

4.5: Other Funds Used for Interlibrary Cooperatives

LSCA I and State funds have been used to support the statewide networking system. The State Library Agency was unable to specify the amount of these funds used for LSCA III type activities.

4.6: Restricted or Discontinued LSCA III Projects

Only one LSCA III project, AMIGOS, was discontinued due to lack of funds. Because all Texas LSCA III projects are intended to be one-year demonstration projects, the impact of low funding levels is minimized. In making applications for LSCA III funding, applicants must include a high-, medium-, and low-level budget. Generally, the project is funded at the minimal level to ensure the funding of as many projects as possible, despite resulting projects not being able to operate at optimal levels.

5: STATE MEMBERSHIP IN INTERSTATE COMPACTS AND MULTI-STATE NETWORKS

One of the objectives stated in the Long-Range Plan for library development is to provide startup funds for interstate, statewide, regional, and local networks of library and information centers consisting of two or more types of libraries. A grant-in-aid was given to the Inter-University Council of the North Texas Area to test the computer output microfilm (COM) technology for producing in-house microform union catalogs. Five libraries are participating in the project including the Texas State Library, Dallas Public Library, Houston Public Library, the Waco-McLennan County Library, and the Stephen F. Austin University Library. The project directly addresses the activities of testing computer support in the production of bibliographic tools and the development of rapid access to unique collections of Texana materials. The project is also linked to OCLC. The catalog is expected to open immediate access to the materials for at least 45 Texas libraries, and eventual access for all Texas libraries as well as libraries participating in OCLC. The demonstration includes testing of costs and utilization patterns of microfilm and microform catalogs as opposed to card catalog prepared lists. The participating libraries will test the use of the two microform catalogs in large and medium-sized public libraries and a university library.

6: INTERACTION BETWEEN THE STATE LIBRARY AGENCY AND LSCA III PROJECTS

There is an intensive interaction between the State and local LSCA III projects. This is accomplished primarily through written reports and informal oral reports. These same methods are utilized by the project to interact with participating libraries. Most participants rate the informal reports as most useful because people tend to be more honest, direct, and open. The participants usually discuss problems encountered with the project when informal oral contact is made and a great deal is learned about the projects by all concerned.

7: STATE AND PROJECT LEVEL ASSESSMENT OF LSCA III PROGRAM MANAGEMENT AT THE FEDERAL LEVEL

7.1: Technical Assistance

The State Library Staff believe that little technical assistance was provided by USOE mainly because the Regional Program Officer's (RPO) expertise was limited in LSCA III projects.

The Regional Program Officer's role was regarded as satisfactory at one point during the 1976 Fiscal Year, but when a new RPO was assigned to the project, the lack of technical expertise in terms of the project limited his impact on the project. The State Library would like to have more interaction from the RPOs in terms of input from USOE which might help further national networking efforts. Most rated the Project Management Review conducted by OLLR as having minimal usefulness for LSCA III projects because its emphasis was on LSCA I.

7.2: Monitoring of Projects

There was feedback on written reports, and this was considered useful. The assessment of the State Management review was reported earlier. The RPO made no project site visits nor was the RPO engaged in any "brainstorming" sessions with the project staff.

7.3: Dissemination of Information and Materials

Dissemination activities are accomplished primarily via publications of the State Library Newsletter and papers presented at Conferences. There was no dissemination activity for the projects at the Federal level.

8: THE FEDERAL FUNDING FORMULA

8.1: Matching Versus Nonmatching State and Federal Funds

All personnel involved in the use of LSCA III funds have asked for increases in funding. Presently, there is a severe limitation on the number of grantees. For example, there is a waiting list of libraries wanting to join the present computer project. Funding has placed great limitations on Texas networking especially because there is no State funding which matches the intent of LSCA III.

8.2: Impact of Increased Federal LSCA III Funds

There has been general agreement that with more funding, the result would be unlimited long-range plans directed toward a sharing of resources, reimbursement to libraries for costs incurred in the delivery of services, and utilization of new technologies. New funds could also be beneficial in the expansion of services and delivery of service.

If LSCA III funds were tripled, the State Library Agency would expand projects in order to reach more libraries with existing cooperative services. They would also find it possible to engage in more activities similar to those currently being funded. All librarians agree that the possibility of reaching the objectives of the libraries in Texas as stated in their long-range plans would be greater if Federal money were tripled. More specifically, the State Agency would have increased the number of public libraries as well as non-public libraries in the AMIGOS project, and would have provided other computerized data bases in the hopes of tying into a statewide network providing these services.

9: IMPACT OF LSCA III IN TEXAS

9.1: Development of LSCA III Type Projects Without Federal Funding

Most librarians agreed that they could not say conclusively that the projects would not have started without Federal funding. While many projects of this type probably would have only developed in academic libraries which have financial resources, public library development of the projects was very much dependent upon LSCA III funding. Certainly, the degree of present library participation in the Texas library cooperatives would have been less without LSCA III funding.

9.2: Achievement of LSCA III Projects in the State

Librarians in Texas generally agree that the LSCA III projects have been highly successful, according to the State Library Agency. However, some librarians do see some of the projects as wasteful in that they are experimental; others believe that the process of funding projects could be better administered if more Federal funding was available. Many librarians dislike the fact that the State has imposed a competitive approach to LSCA III funding. They believe that all libraries should share equally in LSCA III funding through provision of funds directly to each library. Such a move is clearly dependent upon a sizeable increase in the present funding levels.

9.3: Predictability of Funding and Its Impact on Cooperatives

The unpredictability of funding has meant that there has been a constant starting and stopping of projects. Few projects are continuous unless their support is picked up by other funding sources. LSCA III money primarily has become seed money to be used for experimentation. Many dynamic projects are either not funded or are discontinued because of the unpredictability of funding. The AMIGOS project was dropped because of insufficient funding.

10: STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES OF THE LSCA III PROGRAM

Funding is viewed as the greatest shortcoming of the LSCA III program. The amount of money awarded to each State is seen as skimpy. They note that funding is so small that it is impossible to provide systematic coordination. Presently the main problem is trying to choose those projects which can be funded from an excellent group of applications. Too many excellent proposals go unfunded, but there is an alternative. Local librarians are aware of the excellence of their applications, and it does not make for good relations when they are refused funding on the basis of not enough money being available for funding. According to the State Library Agency, the ideal would be for USOE to push for more LSCA III funds, but they understand the difficulty USOE encounters in this area.

The strengths of LSCA III are that 1) the basic thrust at multi-type library cooperation is "on target" and 2) there is flexibility in regard to administration of funds by USOE.

As stated earlier, Texas has adopted the goal of *public library* multi-type networks, but without the legislative mandate for multi-type library cooperation. LSCA III legislation by its definition of multi-type cooperation has given the State Library the authority to coordinate, at least *de facto*, academic, public, school, and special library cooperation.

11. FUTURE DIRECTIONS FOR USOE

In reference to USOE, the Texas Library Agency has expressed great concern about the future of LSCA III especially in view of the NCLIS National Plan. It is also felt that more clear-cut directions and guidance are needed to provide libraries with direction in terms of the National Plan. There is a need to ensure that the directions that the States are taking will interface with a National Network. Finally, there needs to be greater Federal awareness of what is happening with LSCA III funds in the various States--i.e., How successful or unsuccessful have projects been nationwide? This has not been provided to date.

As was stated earlier, the State of Texas is vast, library service is very uneven, and "wealth" in Texas is unevenly spread so that without Federal funding this inequality in library service will continue.

The State Library Agency is dynamic and optimistic about its goals and is attempting to direct itself in line with the National Plan. Among member libraries, the concerns about what constitutes good library service vary. There are many librarians who are very traditional and who are very much threatened by the new "hardware" and technology being thrust upon them. Many see this as impersonal and a trend away from the traditional kind of patron based assistance provided by librarians.

What is the attitude of librarians in Texas about cooperation and networking? Few librarians see cooperation as threatening, but many do not completely understand the role that their library will play in the State's total scheme. Much of this is due to the fact that many librarians still view the State Library Agency as a weak, relatively powerless agency. It is important to remember that only within the past six years did full implementation of a Public Service Library Act come into effect. Some librarians see the activities of the State Library Agency shrouded in mystery. Perhaps more public relations activities will encourage more interchange between the State Library Agency and the local libraries. A survey developed by a doctoral student in librarianship at the University of Texas and a former employee at the State Library Agency sought this local view of the State Agency. In this survey opinion was sought regarding 1) a single State-level agency which coordinates cooperative library and information activities, 2) the ideal role of a State Library Agency, and 3) the priorities to be considered in allocation of State funds for public library development.

The Texas library leadership agree with the objectives of the NCLIS National Program but agree less with the methods advocated for achievement of its objectives. They have much less enthusiasm for professional continuing education than is reflected in general current library literature. There is vigorous opposition to services for the disadvantaged and other special clientele as a result of disillusionment with such library programs in the recent past.

Although there is agreement with the objectives of the National Program, less agreement is evident in trying to determine the proper State level agency to coordinate the cooperative library activities which would result if such a National Program was funded. Agreement on the degree of authority and pattern of centralization of such an agency was also uncertain.

Consideration of State level activities reflects less consensus with the National Program concept of State programming with considerable belief that the State Library Agency should continue as an agency primarily for public libraries. If all library services from all types of libraries were to be coordinated at the State level, a new commission similar to the National Commission for Library and Information Science (NCLIS) might be acceptable. Some felt that a new agency and more State/Federal planning was not needed. But, if inevitable, planning should get the funds into local hands with as few intervening steps as possible to meet those local needs which might be unique and particularly relevant to National or State priorities. Local need is a recurring theme among respondents at the State and local level. The special, contrasting differences between Texas' population extremes--the crowded urban-suburban and the extremely sparsely settled areas--made respondents hesitant to believe that any one pattern or plan/guidelines/regulations could fulfill the needs of both extremes.

The comment was made that much of the State/Federal emphasis is with the sophisticated user, and requires vast amounts of money to be spent to provide a technologically advanced service. However, this will impact only a very small percentage of the library community at a cost which will eventually deprive the library's primary clientele--the patron--of necessary services.

Some librarians see many of the projects funded by LSCA III to be too limited in scope and they urge more projects that are statewide in their future use. There is also a small, but vocal minority of librarians who are very concerned about the State's stress and emphasis on National networking because it is premature and will result in misappropriation and misuse of funds. Local networking is given stronger priority. Some librarians have asked that more cost studies of the new tools technology be conducted. They question the ability of many of these "new services" to be supported once the demonstration or model project is ended.

12: A DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF THE LSCA III PROGRAM IN TEXAS[1]

There were three projects receiving LSCA III funds in Fiscal Year 1976. They were: 1) A Continuing Education for Library Staff in the Southwest (CELS) project, 2) a microform catalog project, and 3) a Statewide Publicity Program for Texas Major Resource Systems. This section describes each project in detail.

CELS had the following goals and objectives to:

- provide quality continuing education opportunities to library staff of all types of libraries in the Southwest;
- create an awareness and sense of need for continuing education of library staff on the part of employees and individuals, and ensure that it is a concomitant part of planning and development in today's changing libraries;
- create an organizational structure to plan, finance, and provide responsive continuing education activities;
- coordinate the efforts of various suppliers of continuing education in order to ensure maximum use of existing resources and eliminate duplication of effort;

---

[1] Because Texas treats its LSCA III projects as a single program, the following discussion deviates from the established format.

- provide continuing education opportunities at regional, State, and local levels in varying designs or packages as needed;
- build in quality control through user evaluations and review by experts within and without the region;
- encourage diversity in the design of continuing education responsive to the needs and priorities of the various States of individual libraries, and of individual staff members; and
- develop a reward system, consistent with the national plan, recognizing the responsibility of the employing institutions.

The South West Library Association/CELS project provides a regional program of continuing education for the six States in the Southwestern region (Arizona, Arkansas, Louisiana, New Mexico, Oklahoma, and Texas). In addition to producing specific training programs upon request from the Texas State Library Agency, the CELS Project provides several other services, including:

- providing long-range planning for the continuing education needs in Texas
- producing programs and packages that can most appropriately be produced at the regional level;
- serving as a clearinghouse for programs developed both within and outside the region so that quality continuing education activities can be shared across State lines;
- providing consultation to the Texas State Library Agency and other groups in any way that will help them to devise effective continuing education activities;
- maintaining an ongoing survey of the state-of-the-art (what is being done, what is needed, and how it will be done); and
- responding to the specific needs of library personnel by planning special programs, preconferences and institutes.

The actual training programs are evaluated by a variety of accepted methods used in adult education programs. Pretests, posttests, and followup are used to determine if educational objectives have been met.

Grants from six State Library Agencies, special grants written for specific purposes, and the sale of programs and packages provide the financial support for CELS. Texas contributed $15,000 of its 1976 LSCA III funds to CELS. These funds are used to reimburse CELS for providing consulting services and training in continuing education delivery systems plus the sources and products mentioned in the preceding paragraphs.

The project personnel consists of a full-time Coordinator, a full-time secretary, and two administrative assistants. Because of increased budgetary assistance received from several funding sources, many of the budget and staff problems have been eliminated.

The CELS project has generated activity and interest in continuing education in Texas. However, questions will need to be answered on how great an impact the project has had. These questions include what is being done now and what would have been done without the CELS project?; are there really increased opportunities for continuing education or are existing opportunities being advertised more efficiently?; has the quality of educational programs improved and if so, what impact did CELS have in improving the programs?; is the average library staff member more interested in continuing his/her education and has CELS made a difference? The project assessment of the CELS project was completed as part of the project's final report and subsequent to the writing of this report.

There is no doubt that the dynamic planning and activities of CELS have promoted the importance of continuing education in Texas' Cooperative/Networking efforts. State Library Agency personnel believe that the final report will show that the project surpassed the objectives set for the project. They see continuing education as a critical area, and that this project dovetails with the national plan on continuing education.

The second LSCA III project, the Microform Catalog Project which received $29,744 in LSCA III funds, had the following goals:

- Select vendors to produce a microfiche and a microfilm catalog from magnetic tape-formatted bibliographic records representing 10,000 to 20,000 Texana titles.
- Input bibliographic records representing four Texas libraries' Texana collections on magnetic tape through the OCLC system. Tapes will be utilized to accomplish production of COM-catalogs listed above.
- Test the dual COM-catalogs in the four participating libraries by collecting data on three months of patron and staff usage.
- Develop input and edit procedures for building tape records using the OCLC system (such procedures will accommodate libraries which do not have in-house access to the OCLC system).
- Make the production of microform catalogs available to small institutions which cannot afford full OCLC system usage.
- Document the procedures established in vendor selection, data preparation, and usage of the COM-catalogs in a test situation.
- Evaluate the usefulness of the two catalog formats to libraries using the catalogs, including advantages and disadvantages and overall public acceptance of the formats.
- Establish standardized cost analyses for use by librarians in selecting vendors and establishing procedures for creating COM-catalogs from an external source.

Five Texas libraries (Stephen F. Austin University Library, Waco-McLennon County Library, Dallas Public Library, Houston Public Library, and the Texas State Library) worked with the AMIGOS Bibliographical Council to develop and test the use of microfilm and microfiche catalogs of the libraries combined Texana collections. Each library contributes catalog information describing its books about Texas to AMIGOS in order to produce this microform catalog. AMIGOS, a network of libraries in five States working together to provide expanded library services, while cutting costs by using advanced data processing techniques, utilizes an on-line computer system accessing more than two million bibliographic records stored in a computer at Ohio College Library Center (OCLC) in Columbus to generate input for the COM-catalog.

Library users can gain access to Texas books of all five libraries through catalogs located at each of the libraries. The development and use of microform catalogs will be documented to help other libraries in the State determine if microform catalogs are feasible and cost-effective card-catalog replacements.

This project also involves the development and testing of dual COM-catalogs of the Texana collections of five libraries in Texas. The union catalogs were produced by vendors selected during the project on a competitive bid. This selection process was to be documented to assist libraries in future decisionmaking procedures. Each participating library will test the use of the COM-produced union catalog in two formats: microfiche and microfilm. The project was to document and/or make available to the professional community the following: vendor selection process and results; production procedures and cost statistics for preparation of machine-readable bibliographic data using OCLC system; participating library staff acceptance of the catalog formats; library user acceptance of the catalog formats; and microform copies of the union catalog.

Spin-off effects of this program include: the projected use of the documentation by librarians to select and implement microform catalogs as a cost-and-time saving feature of catalog preparation.

The Inter-University Council of the North Texas Area served as the LSCA III grant recipient which then used a contractor to provide the services described earlier.

Several problems arose during the operation of the project. The time schedule was not adhered to due to technical delays. For instance, microfiche and tapes often were late arriving from the computer processing companies. Additionally, because salaries paid to terminal operators were low, high staff turnover required repeated staff training.

The impact of the project has not been measured formally because the final report has not been completed. However, State Library Agency personnel and the staff of the Inter-University Council of the North Texas Area believe that they have accomplished what they set out to do. On the other hand, while the impact of the microform catalogs will be analyzed and measured in the final report, the administrative staff of the Dallas Public Library have reservations about it. They believe the product (union catalog and lists) is good, but the steps taken in the manufacture are poor. They believe that this was a public service project which did not allow for public service input at the beginning of the project. Because of this, they believe that they are learning very little from the project. They comment that the patrons have responded negatively to both microfilm and microform. However, the staff is not completely negative in their feelings about the project. They see the project as serving the need for experimentation in providing these services. As one person noted, "If it allows us to make mistakes and to profit by them, then the project is important."

Other evaluations of this LSCA III project included the following. The Chief of Technical Services at the University of Texas Health Services Center believes that the OCLC aspect of the project is of minimal benefit to special libraries because of their special cataloging demands and specifications. The State Library Personnel believe that in view of the future directions in libraries, this project has the highest priority. They would like to see it expanded to include more public libraries, junior colleges, and school libraries. They would also like to see more vendor services coming from the project similar to the Texas Numerical Register (a computer-based cataloging and bibliographic system).

A third LSCA III project, the Statewide Publicity Program for the Texas Major Resource Systems operated by the Texas Library Association and which received $21,600 in LSCA III funds, had the following goals to:

- implement the public relations program outlined below using the conceptual message, "Texas libraries equal information";
- reach the users as well as non-users;
- better inform librarians of the systems concept;
- evaluate and report the program and evaluation; and
- determine the feasibility of continuing a public relations campaign.

In order to accomplish its objectives the public relations project undertook the following activities:

- Radio Spot Announcements. Spot Announcements were prepared in English and Spanish by experienced radio station personnel to be transmitted as a public service by radio stations throughout Texas. Nearly 400 AM and FM stations received the announcements. Separate messages were recorded for each of the ten system areas.
- Television Spot Announcements. Television commercials were taped individually for the ten system areas as well as individually for the major stations in each area. Local personalities were used for public service announcements.
- Newspaper and Periodical Articles. Feature articles were developed using a professional advertising firm and offered to major newspapers for the feature sections of Sunday newspapers. Feature articles were also offered to such magazines as Texas Monthly and to those insurance companies, banks, utility companies, etc. which regularly sponsor public service announcements. The articles stressed the kinds of services available from all three types of libraries. In addition, examples of cooperation among types of libraries throughout Texas were featured.
- Brochures, Flyers and Bookmarks. Large numbers of short messages, flyers, and bookmarks were printed and offered to utility companies, major grocery chains, and other organizations which agreed to distribute the messages in mailing envelopes or in grocery bags. These materials were prepared by the same advertising firm which produced the newspaper articles.
- Advertisements in Public Transportation Vehicles. Appropriate messages advertising the services of libraries in general were formatted for printing on "Car Cards" and installed in the buses of all Texas city systems for up to three months at a time.

- Advertisements via Billboards. Messages were affixed to billboards throughout the State. The billboards were obtained from local advertising companies at public service rates. All ten system regions were included in this campaign.
- Information for Librarians. Notices were prepared for public, school and college librarians to advise them of the publicity campaign as it developed. They were encouraged to welcome new, untutored users of the system. Success of the public relations campaign depended directly upon the cooperation and efforts of the librarians throughout the State--especially the ten system coordinators. These persons were encouraged to coordinate their individual system of public relations programs with the statewide public relations program. The services offered were the development and implementation of a statewide information program which, by employing various media, informed the public of the various services available to them through the Texas Library system via their local public library as well as the resources and services of the major regional systems.

There was great enthusiasm about this project among patrons and the project's professional staff. There was some concern about the quality of production in some areas and also some doubts as to whether the public relations materials were as good as they could have been. State Library Agency personnel believe, however, that limited funds prevented more refined production. To support this belief, they cited the fact that the Illinois State Library Agency used $400,000 for a similar public relations program.

Funding for this project has since been shifted from LSCA III to LSCA I in order to augment the level of effort. This means that the project will now only affect public libraries. Yet the impact of the project is viewed as overwhelmingly successful. The Director of the Irving Public Library, for example, expressed satisfaction with the professional expertise of public relations that was now available to all libraries in the State, and that this was especially helpful for small libraries where there is a lack of staff time for such activities. The State Library personnel believe that the program surpassed its objectives. They believe that public information is vital. Promotion of interlibrary networking is important.

INTERLIBRARY COOPERATION AND NETWORKING: A CASE STUDY OF LSCA III AT THE STATE AND PROJECT LEVEL

State Visited:	Commonwealth of Virginia
LSCA III Project Visited:	Virginia Interlibrary Communication
Period Studied:	Fiscal Year 1976

1: INTRODUCTION

Until about 1970, management of libraries in Virginia could have been described as conservative in terms of the collections and services provided to patrons. At that time, however, restructuring of Virginia's libraries took place, with the result that greater emphasis was placed on improving services to patrons. Also, in response to population growth, new industry, and urbanization, Virginia libraries have moved increasingly in the direction of regional cooperation, outreach programs, multimedia, automation, and building collections.

In 1975, the Office of Library Cooperation was established as part of the State Library Agency. It is specifically responsible for interlibrary cooperation activities in Virginia. The Office's aim is one of improving communications among libraries in the State through the use of teletype, telephone, and telefacsimile, as well as encouraging pilot projects, establishing uniform quality standards, and conducting seminars for continuing education. Five programs evolved from the Office of Interlibrary Cooperation in 1976:

- Virginia Interlibrary Communication: a statewide WATS, and TWX system serving public, academic, and special libraries.
- Union List of Serials: to combine the holdings of 63 major libraries in the State.
- Regional Cooperative Projects: to develop shared resources among libraries on a regional basis.
- Catalog of Virginia: to catalog Virginia's holdings in the State Library with the goal of eventually containing holdings in other libraries throughout the State.
- Education, Training, Conferences: to conduct educational and training sessions for librarians.

Of these five programs, the first and second have received LSCA III funding. The first project was studied as part of this case study of LSCA III in Virginia.

2: MANAGEMENT OF LSCA III AT THE STATE LEVEL

2.1: Needs Assessment

Virginia conducts a needs assessment annually, but needs assessment can occur at any time the State Library Agency staff deem it necessary. For instance, during 1974 and 1975 a study was conducted in a nine-county area of Virginia for the purpose of developing recommendations for cooperative library services. The Library Development Branch of the State Library Agency is responsible for conducting needs assessment.

2.2: Defining LSCA III Objectives and Priorities

The State Library Agency has given the following objectives top priority in the development of Virginia's libraries:

- Public library service for the 23 counties now without service.
- More than 2,750,000 additional volumes in public libraries to meet the State standard of between two and four books per person per library service area. Only 15 public libraries (including town libraries) meet the basic standard of two volumes per capita.
- Library facilities within the reach of every citizen. Of the 73 regional, county, and city libraries in the State, 32 are housed in quarters that are totally inadequate. All categories of libraries need branch buildings.
- Materials and staff to carry out programs designed to serve the disadvantaged citizens of the State. Recognized needs include programs for improving reading skills, story hours for children in hospitals and other institutions, jails and detention home programs, and service to the aged. One mechanism for accomplishing this will be a public relations program designed to reach the disadvantaged.
- More professional librarian positions to further full service programs.

The State Librarian judged that the objectives of Virginia matched perfectly with the objectives of the LSCA III Program. In terms of Virginia's Five-Year Plan, the role of LSCA III is to assist in making the total resources of the State available to all library users.

According to the State Librarian the long-range program is very useful in setting objectives for LSCA III projects, and the LSCA III regulations are moderately useful. The review of LSCA III objectives seldom results in any changes in objectives. Availability of funds is the single most important factor influencing the decision to change LSCA III objectives.

2.3: Policymaking at the State Level Relative to LSCA III

LSCA III policymaking involves several persons. The LSCA Advisory Council is involved in setting objectives for projects and for allocating LSCA III resources. The State Librarian is involved in assessing needs, setting priorities, setting objectives for LSCA funding, determining criteria for allocating LSCA III resources, and the actual allocating of LSCA III resources. The LSCA III Program Coordinator and the Staff Library staff are also involved in these policymaking activities. The USOE Regional Program Officer and personnel from member libraries participate in project needs assessment, setting priorities and in setting objectives.

2.4: The Role of the LSCA Advisory Council and State Library Agency Personnel in LSCA III

Although an LSCA Advisory Council exists, its role in LSCA III is minimal. Their assistance in the review and selection of proposals varies. The opportunity for recommending policy exists, but that function also varies. Its advice on budget matters is limited because of the complexity of the budget. The opportunity exists for the Advisory Council to advise on the development of the State plan, but the State Library Agency places more reliance on the professional librarians in Virginia. The Advisory Council does not participate in the day-to-day operations of the projects, but they do have access to project reports. The Council is made up of lay persons and professional librarians.

The Head of the State Library Agency allots about 5 percent of the monthly schedule to LSCA III projects, the LSCA Coordinator about 5 percent, and LSCA III Coordinator about 90 percent. The Director of Library Services spends 10-15 percent of each month, the Head of the General Library 5 percent; a professional librarian 100 percent; and 2 clerical workers 100 percent on the project.

2.5: Allocation of LSCA III Funds

The State Library Agency uses two methods for allocating LSCA III funds: (1) proposals are solicited from the field by the State Library Development Branch, and (2) proposals are solicited from specific individuals or institutions for specific projects. This means that a particular ongoing project could be considered for LSCA III funding if the State Library Agency staff sees that the results of such a pilot project might be used in other library settings.

In reviewing proposals for funding, the State Library Agency staff have found it useful to apply the following criteria: 1) the relationship to the long-range program of the library, 2) the soundness of the operational plan of the proposal, 3) availability of local funds over Federal funding, 4) how the proposed project fits into the State's scheme of priorities for library development, and 5) applicability of the project to other library settings. Funds are allocated on an annual basis.

2.6: Budgetary Preparation and Controls

The budget preparation team is made up of the State Librarian, the State LSCA III Coordinator, the LSCA Project Director, the Director of Library Development, and the State Library Council. The State Library Agency is directed by a board consisting of nine members, appointed by the Governor, and has the final authority to approve all budgets. This authority is rarely used because the State Librarian's decisions are generally agreed to by the Council and Governor's office.

The LSCA III Advisory Council reviews all project expenditures annually. There is also an annual review and approval by the State

Comptroller's Office. According to the LSCA III Coordinator, the State Librarian monitors project expenditures on a periodic basis.

2.7: Evaluation by the State Library Agency

The State Library Agency uses a number of evaluation methods to assess the progress and impact of its LSCA III projects. Most often these evaluations are informal and result from continuous contact with participating libraries, meetings with patrons (indirect feedback), and review of request records. From time to time the State Library Agency does conduct more formal evaluations such as the 1976 survey of member library operations. In general these evaluation methods are judged to be quite useful by the State Library Agency, though there was no indication of any changes resulting in projects which resulted from the evaluations.

3: IMPACT AND USE OF FEDERAL AND STATE REQUIREMENTS AND CONTROLS ON LSCA III ACTIVITIES

3.1: LSCA Requirements/Controls

The State Librarian rates the Five-Year State Plan as very useful, and the Annual Plan as only fairly useful, and believes that the Annual Program requirement could be made more useful if funding were available for periods longer than one year. If this process were used, better long-range planning could be undertaken.

The State Librarian would also like to see statistics in project reports compiled nationally--that is, the Federal Government would assume the responsibility of monitoring cumulative LSCA III statistics as opposed to asking each State to supply past statistical data about LSCA III projects, funding, and services.

The emphasis on evaluation is considered futile and the attempt to evaluate a $60,000 program which should aid 4.5 million people is impossible. On the other hand, the State Librarian perceives the requirement for a State Advisory Council as a good one, but notes that it is "hard to get the Council involved in the projects."

3.2: State Requirements Controls

The State Librarian judged the State's legislation regarding State LSCA III program goals to be very supportive in two areas:

- authorization to work with all types of libraries; and
- goals of LSCA III efforts in Virginia

The State legislature has provided limited funds to support library cooperation and networking.

4: USE OF LSCA III FUNDS BY THE STATE LIBRARY AGENCY

4.1: Types and Numbers of LSCA III Projects Funded

The following table summarizes the LSCA III projects operated in Virginia from 1967 to 1976. As can be seen from this table, most LSCA III funds have been administered by the State Library Agency and have been used to develop reference and cataloging tools.

During Fiscal Year 1976 two projects were funded under LSCA III, the Virginia Interlibrary Communications Project and the Supplement to the Union List of Serials for Public, College, and Special Libraries. The focus of this profile is the former project. The Virginia Interlibrary Communications project received $44,500, while the Supplement to the Union List of Serials for Public, College, and Special Libraries project received $6,300 in LSCA III funds.

4.2: Products Resulting from the Availability of LSCA III Funds

According to the State Librarian, LSCA III has enabled Virginia to install and use TWX equipment in a number of libraries throughout the State. Also attributed to LSCA III is the completion of special studies and participation in multistate library cooperatives such as SOLINET (Southeastern Library Information Network).

4.3: Adequacy and Ratios of Funding Sources

The State Library Agency staff has expressed greater concern about inadequate Federal funding than about State and local funding. The State Legislature legally provides for State funds to be used for

LSCA III PROJECTS FOR THE STATE OF VIRGINIA

YEAR	TITLE OF PROJECT	ADMINISTERING AGENCY	SOURCE OF FUNDS				USE		
			LSCA III	STATE	LOCAL	OTHER	SALARIES	EQUIPMENT	OTHER
1968	1. Newspaper and Periodical Printouts	Virginia State Library	$15,734						
	2. Cooperative Book Catalog	Northern Virginia Community College	25,000					$25,000	
	3. TWX	Virginia State Library	600					$ 600	
	4. Contractual Services	(as above)	8,930						$ 8,930 (contractual)
1969[1]									
1970	1. TWX	(as above)	25,105					25,105	
	2. Cooperative Book Catalog	Northern Virginia Community College	21,559						
	3. Union List of Serials for Public Colleges and Special Libraries	Virginia State Library	8,448						
1971	1. Administration	(as above)	166				$ 166		
	2. Virginia Interlibrary Communication		31,823						
	3. Catalog of Virginia's History, Politics, and Culture Holdings at State Library	(as above)	31,349						
1972	1. Education and Training Conferences	(as above)	18,278						18,278
	2. Catalog of Virginians		9,000						
	3. Catalog of Films Available for Loan to Virginia Libraries		2,093					2,093	
	4. Virginia Interlibrary Communications		48,596						-
1973	1. Educational Conferences	(as above)	838						838
	2. Expansion of Virginia Catalog		10,000					10,000	
	3. Expansion of Union List of Serials		7,127						
	4. Virginia Regional Interlibrary Cooperation		16,950 47,132[2]						
	5. Virginia Interlibrary Communications		54,944[3]						
1974									
1975	1. Virginia Interlibrary Communications Network	(as above)	17,039						-
	2. Regional Cooperative Projects	(as above)	43,198						
1976	1. Expansion of Virginia Interlibrary Communications Network	(as above)	44,500				10,500		34,000 (contractual)
	2. Supplement to Union List of Serials	(as above)	6,300					6,300	6,300 (contractual)

[1] Data not available

[2] Carryover from FY 73

[3] Carryover from FY 73

multi-type library cooperation development, and State funds have and are being used for cooperative projects. However State Library Agency staff agree that most local funding is poor, and greater Federal funding would allow the State to expand funding of projects thereby including all sectors of the State.

4.4: Use of LSCA III Funds to Join Existing Cooperatives and Networks

The LSCA III Coordinator believes that it is much more practical to use State funds than Federal funds to join existing cooperatives or networks. It is more convenient to use State funds not only because fewer reporting mechanisms are required, but also because State funding would necessarily result in more local library participation. That is, as disseminator of State funds, the State Library Agency staff must involve all libraries in the State in its allocations. Federal funding used to join existing cooperatives often affects few of the libraries in the State because of the small amount of money allocated by the Federal Government. On the other hand, the possibility of using more Federal funds for developing new cooperative and/or networking projects that are needed was suggested.

4.5: Other Funds Used for Interlibrary Cooperation

State and local funds have been used for several cooperatives during Fiscal Year 1976. Regional cooperative projects received $7,225 in State funds and an unspecified amount of local funds. These funds, distributed on a reimbursement basis, are used to conduct regional projects in various parts of the State. Librarians from various kinds of libraries are encouraged to develop programs for sharing library services and materials to improve services to all residents of an area.

Also in the Northern Virginia area of the State, Alexandria, Fairfax Regional, Arlington County, Prince William County, and Loudoun County public libraries, the Northern Virginia Community College and George Mason University are participating in a Washington Metropolitan Area Council of Government project which engages in cooperative buying and lending, publicity, and delivery. This is an ongoing project.

In an effort to improve available reference services as well as to foster broader regional cooperation, 13 libraries in the Hampton Roads area of Virginia have established Project TIMES, an information network through which they share access to the New York Times Information Book. Administered by a board of directors including a representative from each of the thirteen participants and a non-voting member from the State Library Agency staff, the project involves six public and seven academic libraries which serve residents of the Tidewater area, including Williamsburg, Hampton, Chesapeake, Norfolk, Portsmouth, and Virginia Beach. Anticipating that a second year of operation for Project TIMES would be funded locally, the State Library Agency awarded an LSCA III Grant of $42,531.00 to finance the program during the calendar year 1975.

The Piedmont Mailbox Library is a regional project financed with State funds allotted for cooperative programs. The State Library Agency is assisting the Longwood College Library to provide service by mail to people in six of the seven counties in the Piedmont region of the rural central part of Virginia both directly and through the existing small public libraries. This pilot program also will test the feasibility of a books-by-mail program in serving an entire district regardless of what other library services are available.

All of these regional cooperative projects are planned in close cooperation with the State Library Agency regional consultants and are reviewed by the cooperative programs' librarian.

In a second cooperative area, Virginia has been active in educational training conferences for librarians. This project contributes directly to the objective of improving interlibrary communications and facilitating interlibrary cooperation in the State. Educational and training sessions for librarians from all types of libraries provide instruction in various administrative areas such as cataloging, planning, programming budgeting, and personnel. This project is particularly important because there is no formal continuing education program in the State, and many residents have attended, at a considerable expense to themselves, courses given outside Virginia. Thus, the State Library Administrator is aware of the significant need for continuing educational programs, and feels that administering and financing educational programs and conferences under the auspices of library cooperation is well justified.

4.6: Restricted or Discontinued LSCA III Projects

The State Librarian reported that no projects begun with LSCA III funds and important enough to continue were discontinued or hampered because of the unavailability of funds. No project was begun with LSCA funds alone. State and local funds have been available for continuation of needed projects.

5: STATE MEMBERSHIP IN INTERSTATE COMPACTS AND MULTISTATE NETWORKS

The State Library Agency is presently a member of the Southeastern Library Network (SOLINET) a computerized processing service for library materials. Tied to the master data bank of bibliographical information at the Ohio College Library Center, Virginia's network membership is comprised of five libraries that use the data bank as a source of cataloging data. The State Librarian was unable to assess the advantages and disadvantages of having membership in this compact.

6: INTERACTION BETWEEN THE STATE LIBRARY AGENCY AND LSCA III PROJECTS

LSCA III projects provide monthly written reports to the State Library Agency. They also provide formal and informal oral reports as the need arises. While the informal reports are judged as having less usefulness than the formal reporting methods, it is interesting to note that project staff for the Interlibrary Communications Project want to increase the number of meetings with the State Library Agency. Also, they would like to see the State increase its assistance to the project.

7: STATE AND PROJECT LEVEL ASSESSMENT OF LSCA III PROGRAM MANAGEMENT AT THE FEDERAL ROLE

7.1: Technical Assistance

The State Library Agency staff noted that technical assistance was provided by the USOE, but that its usefulness was questionable. The State Library Agency staff did not find the review and feedback on written reports very useful and, in fact, felt that for such a small amount of Federal money, too much detailed reporting was necessary. Site visits were also of little use. They believe that there was a lack of understanding of the problems by the Regional Program Officer. A project management report was prepared, but the State never received any response from the regional office.

7.2: Monitoring of Projects

Interaction between the Federal, Regional, and State level is primarily via written reports. The Regional Program Officer is not involved in the monitoring of projects. The State regards the quality of monitoring, when received, as good.

7.3: Dissemination of Information and Materials

The State Library Agency staff and project staff made use of newsletters and State Library Agency publications as well as dissemination media. The Federal program personnel have not participated in this.

8: THE FEDERAL FUNDING FORMULA

8.1: Matching Versus Nonmatching of State and Federal Funds

The LSCA III Coordinator expressed satisfaction with the nonmatching funding policy associated with LSCA III, maintaining that the State Library Agency has had no trouble in obtaining State funds without the added leverage of mandatory matching. Thus any move to require matching would not be expected to improve Virginia's current efforts.

8.2: Impact of Increased Federal LSCA III Funds

The State Library Agency advocates the need for a ten-fold increase in the basic amount of the Federal grant to Virginia. The staff notes that this increase would allow more libraries to be reached with the existing services, would provide new activities that cannot be engaged in now because of lack of funds, and would also allow for the addition of more computer terminals. The primary aim of such an increase would be to allow the State Library Agency to develop more needs assessments and to further network development.

A tripling of LSCA III funds would allow for acceleration of the current program as well as reaching more libraries. New activities such as a Circulation Bibliographic Retrieval (already in the planning stage) could be put into operation more quickly.

9: IMPACT OF LSCA III IN VIRGINIA

9.1: Development of LSCA III Type Projects Without Federal Funding

As stated earlier, the Interlibrary Communications Project was already developed and operating before it received Federal funding. The additional funding allowed its services to be extended to more libraries in the State. Also, the State operates three other cooperative projects suggesting that while Federal funds have no doubt been of assistance, they were not the impetus for cooperative development.

9.2: Achievement of LSCA III Projects

LSCA III projects have interlinked a number of libraries throughout Virginia. Also the State Library Agency has been able to improve its union catalog and reference resources. Finally, LSCA III has facilitated State involvement in multistate cooperatives.

9.3: Predictability of Funding and Impact on Cooperatives

The State Librarian is quite concerned about the predictability of LSCA III funding and its impact on library cooperation projects. The short-range nature of funding makes it difficult to plan for cooperative programs when it is not known if Federal funds will be awarded. Without knowing that funds will be forthcoming, planning is viewed as a near useless activity.

10: STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES OF LSCA III

Most librarians visited in Virginia as part of this study view LSCA III as the basis for discussing the expansion of cooperative efforts. As such it functions as a focal point. However, LSCA III tends to be projected in a negative light more often than not. Many librarians including staff at the State Library Agency felt too unsure to comment on LSCA III. When LSCA III was assessed, generally, it was felt that the low level and unpredictability of funding were its two greatest weaknesses. In addition, program support in the form of direction and technical assistance are missing at the Federal level. Also, the fact that LSCA III is directed to the State Library Agency was viewed by one librarian as a restriction to the development of multistate cooperatives.

Supportive comments directed toward LSCA III include the fact that it represents the only Federal initiative to achieve library cooperation which impacts the State and local levels.

11: FUTURE DIRECTIONS FOR USOE

When addressing this issue, a number of librarians were quick to note the interactive, uncoordinated roles of USOE, NCLIS, and the Library of Congress in the development of interlibrary cooperation and networking. The State Librarian observed that USOE, not NCLIS, should be the source of increased funding and guidance especially in the development of regional cooperation. An academic librarian was insistent that the Library of Congress should act as the hub of networking because it has the greatest level of professionalism which is the most important basis for networking. Clearly, the emphasis for networking and cooperation must come from the Federal level primarily because it is able to fund activities which necessarily cross local jurisdictional boundaries.

Regardless of who acts as the primary Federal force behind networking and cooperation, most of the librarians in Virginia see the need for continuity in funding. Funds must be increased, and they must be predictable. There is a feeling that while receptivity towards networking and cooperation is high at the local level, libraries cannot pick up funding. In Virginia there is a willingness for the State to increase the level of support of LSCA III activities but it is evident that such an increase must be accompanied by corresponding increases at the Federal and local level.

12: A DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF VIRGINIA INTERLIBRARY COMMUNICATION

12.1: Services Offered by the Project

The Virginia Interlibrary Communications Project (VICP) has as its objective improving communications between major reference and interlibrary loan centers and local libraries. The three most important services provided by the project are:

- The State Library Agency receives calls (WATS or TWX) from all libraries in the State and acts as a clearinghouse by either researching questions in-house or, if necessary, referring them to the appropriate research library in the State. The WATS Line from all libraries in the State to the State Library Reference Desk and teletype machine connections between it and 17 major research libraries within the State allow the State Library Agency to serve in an interlibrary loan clearinghouse capacity.
- The "please call" messages handled through the WATS line reflect the VICP's role in aiding statewide library development. Any library is able to call the State Library Agency Reference Desk, and a return call will be made by the State Library Agency to respond to the request.
- Communication between the State Library film department and the public concerning the borrowing of films. Films are mailed to the requesting library.

This project contributes directly to LSCA III objectives of improving communications between major reference and interlibrary centers and local libraries.

Added to the regular service of the communications network is an automatic bibliographic searching service in the subject area of clinical medicine. Requests for searches are relayed through the

State's library system to the University of Virginia's Medical School Library which shares responsibility for the searches. Through the TWX terminals maintained there, the computers at the National Library of Medicine and the State University of New York Biomedical Communication Network can be queried on an "on-line" basis, and printout of stored bibliographic data can be produced. An annual survey is conducted by the Office of Cooperative Library Programs in order to closely monitor the system so that it can be ascertained the project is receiving maximum usage at minimum expense.

12.2: Funding Sources

The Virginia Interlibrary Communication project received $18,235 in LSCA III funds and $14,009 in State funds during Fiscal Year 1976. The funding is used to pay telecommunications costs.

12.3: Interaction with the State Library Agency

Because this project is based in the State Library Agency, interaction per se does not occur.

12.4: Staffing

The project has one professional librarian (20 hours) and two paraprofessionals (20 hours each) assigned to the project. In addition, all reference librarians at the State Library Agency may provide reference services to local member libraries via WATS lines.

12.5: Role of the Project Advisory Council

There is no project advisory council.

12.6: Problems

Funding has limited the availability of the communications project's services in its expanded (TWX's) form so that only a limited number of libraries in the State are tied into the system. Also, more WATS lines are needed. Presently, requests are backlogged at the State Library Agency reference desk because of limited WATS access. There is also too little space for the telecommunications equipment at the State Library. Presently the equipment is housed in the General Reference Department while better quarters are sought.

Along with their regular reference duties in the State Library's Reference Department, the staff must also assist in providing service to the local libraries in the State via the WATS line. As a result, there is discontinuity of service to each because of this dual role. Efforts are needed to increase the staff and to maintain a separate department for project operations.

12.7: Evaluation by the LSCA III Project

The LSCA III Coordinator and the Project Director have made efforts to solicit continuous informal feedback from the member libraries in the interlibrary communications project. This has been facilitated by the WATS line which has allowed the member library staff to keep in easy contact with the project staff. The member librarians have forwarded reactions of their patrons vis-a-vis the project to the project staff. The project staff has mentioned that they have used, to some extent, analyses of cost and usage statistics as an evaluative process. This analysis has been focused primarily on the number of incoming calls from each member library and the telephone charges involved in maintaining this service.

Annual formal evaluations of the project have been conducted by the LSCA III project staff and other State Library Agency personnel. They note that by analyzing usage statistics and by almost daily telephone contact with member libraries, it is possible for them to do an almost constant up-to-date evaluation.

12.8: Impact

The project has made the collections of all libraries in the State accessible to all the State's residents via WATS lines and TWX equipment. The TWX lines have been particularly beneficial to academic libraries because they facilitate interlibrary loan requests. In the words of the Project Director, the project has become an accepted part of library services.

The present project has almost total acceptance by librarians in the State although they note some of the problems involved in its service. There is often a backlog of calls into the State Library Agency. Patrons must often wait for lengthy periods to receive a response to their requests. Some member librarians would like to see more workshops provided by the State Library Agency to orient member library staffs to all of the services available. They also would like more guidelines about the role and direction of cooperation issued from the State Library Agency.

12.9: Role of Project in the State's Cooperative and Networking Efforts

The project complements the aims of networking and cooperatives planned for the State quite well. The Cooperative Programs Director noted that the State was working well toward cooperation in spite of Federal funding--not because of it.

12.10: Linkages With Other Library Cooperative and Network Projects

The project is not directly linked with any other cooperative projects but does have access to SOLINET through the consortium academic libraries in Virginia.

13: EVALUATION AND CONCLUSIONS

Although the State Library Agency has set a high priority for cooperatives and networks, they appear to be operating at a very low level. The present program is regarded with receptiveness by member libraries but with the realization that much more is needed. The State Library Agency does not appear to show leadership or display innovative ideas vis-a-vis cooperation. There was little evidence that beyond this project, very much planning had taken place to design a resourceful State/National Program. The most innovative thinking seems to occur among the academic librarians who have given a great amount of thought to the direction in which the State should be headed.

It is highly recommended that a committee of all sectors of the library profession be formed to plan the direction for Virginia cooperation and networks. The Committee must tap the thinking of all librarians in the State as some of them feel isolated from the State Library Agency. Finally, it seems evident that while librarians in the State are receptive to cooperation and networking, they need clear-cut guidelines and planning. Presently, this is non-existent. Perhaps the Virginia Library Association can provide the needed leadership.